National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canadä

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE SLOVENES IN THE REVOLUTION OF 1848-1849:

Agrarian Issues and Budding Nationalism at the Austrian Constitutional Parliament

BY

© **Kristine L. A. Smalcel Pederson**

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of **Master of Arts**.

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

Edmonton, Alberta
Spring 1994

National Library of Canada
Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services Branch
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction des acquisitions et des services bibliographiques
395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-612-11373-6

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: **Kristine L.A. Smalcel Pederson**

TITLE OF THESIS: **THE SLOVENES IN THE REVOLUTION OF 1848-1849: Agrarian Issues and Budding Nationalism at the Austrian Constitutional Parliament.**

DEGREE: **Master of Arts**

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: **1994**

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as hereinbefore provided neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

Kristine Smalcel Pederson

Suite 207, 10815 - 83 Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta
Canada T6E 2E6

22 April, 1994

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled **The Slovenes in the Revolution of 1848-1849: Agrarian Issues and Budding Nationalism at the Austrian Constitutional Parliament** submitted by **Kristine L. A. Smalcel Pederson** in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of **Master of Arts**.

John-Paul Himka

Dr. John-Paul Himka, Professor of History
(Supervisor)

David C. Johnson

Dr. David C. Johnson, Professor of History
(Committee Chairman)

Dr. Martin Katz, Professor Emeritus of History
(Committee Member)

Dr. Thomas F. Keating, Associate Professor
of Political Science (Committee Member)

22 April, 1994

To Dad,
for sharing your
love of country

and

to Mark,
for being you.

ABSTRACT

The constitutional parliament of 1848-1849 is an excellent case study that illuminates the stage at which Slovene nationalism was in the mid-nineteenth century. The main issue of concern for all Slovenes was the peasant issue, since almost the entire population was still involved in agriculture in 1848. Slovene peasants were primarily interested in improving their socio-economic position; therefore, studying the agrarian issue is central to discovering who the Slovenes were on the eve of their full awakening. Even the Slovene bourgeois intellectual liberals who attended the parliament as delegates showed unusual sensitivity toward the issue. Importantly, it was the one issue discussed at the parliament in which the full Slovene delegation participated. Secondary to this during the revolutionary years was the idea of Slovene political unity -- an issue that was also debated by members of the parliament, but not yet at the forefront of Slovene interest. The agrarian issue represented the Slovene past while the idea of Slovene unity was the issue of the future. The meeting point for these two important topics in Slovene history was the Vienna/Kremsier parliament of 1848-1849 which is the focus of the following thesis. Because the population was almost fully agrarian, the agricultural reforms of the revolutionary years were extremely important. The small Slovene intelligentsia of 1848-1849 was mostly interested in nationalism, but there were a few Slovene intellectuals of a more moderate outlook who addressed both issues during the revolution, and specifically at the constitutional parliament. Their efforts ensured that a free agrarian population would, soon after the revolution, be awakened, politicized and interested in nationhood.

PREFACE

Upon discussing suitable thesis topics, Professor Himka and I agreed (after some hesitation on my part) that the Austrian revolution of 1848-1849 would be a good framework to work from. Because of my personal interest in Slovene history, and the lack of scholarly works written in English about it, Dr. Himka encouraged me to explore the topic of Slovenes in 1848-1849. It has not been an easy journey, and the subject has been far from exhausted by my efforts, but I have greatly enjoyed the project.

There is very little material available to scholars interested in Slovene history. The fact that this problem is amplified in North America made writing the thesis seem unfeasible at times, but I am glad we were able to at least overcome the very basic obstacles. I readily acknowledge that the limitations of available sources have greatly affected the scope of this work, but it is still hoped that the thesis will be a useful introduction to others who are interested in related subjects and time periods.

The Slovenes have traditionally been overlooked, or dismissed as insignificant, by historians. The research I have done has given me a view of the Slovenes that is quite different from many others. Despite having a moderate recent political history, they have been radical in their own quiet way. They have avoided mass assimilation into larger and more well-developed neighbouring cultures during the periods of Habsburg and Yugoslav overlordship; and they have developed from an unawakened agrarian society in the mid-nineteenth century into today's awakened, culturally sophisticated, and industrialized independent Republic of Slovenia. In short, the Slovenes are an important and interesting part of modern central European history -- something I hope readers of this essay will discover for themselves.

Slovene words used in this thesis have been written without diacritical marks. I am of course responsible for any errors and omissions regarding all spelling, style and content.

KSP

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge Professor John-Paul Himka for giving me the confidence and support I needed to start and complete this thesis and my degree. He is a unique individual who is able to combine academic and teaching excellence with an uncommonly sensitive personal touch. I am grateful for all his insightful comments as well as his patience, kindness and timely humour! I would also like to thank Dr. Helen Liebel-Weckowicz for her guidance in the early part of this degree.

Without the help of several other individuals it would have been impossible to look at the Slovenes in 1848-1849. First of all, Dr. Tom Priestly, Professor of Slavic and East European Studies, was instrumental in helping me identify Slovene sources. Dr. Priestly was also kind enough to provide me with a written introduction to the Slovene historian, Professor Carole Rogel of Ohio State University. Dr. Rogel was very helpful in confirming that we had identified the most useful sources about the Slovenes in 1848-1849. She also took the time to share some valuable personal insights into the topic. Since the materials relating to this topic were often difficult to secure, I would like to extend a special thank-you to Alan Rutkowski, University of Alberta librarian. Lastly I would like to thank my father, Ervin Smalcel, for his assistance with the Slovene-language materials.

A project like a thesis cannot be done in complete isolation. There are many individuals who have made the past few years bearable, and/or enjoyable, and I hereby salute them with an inadequate thank-you. The following people are a special few who have been particularly helpful regarding my thesis: Naomi Nind, Carolee Pollock, Dr. Richard Vaudry, Bob Cole and Linda Bridges. Thanks! I would also like to acknowledge the history department staff -- Lydia Dugbazah, Linda Bridges, Sheryl Iverson and Louise Jenkins -- for their patience, encouragement and friendly conversations.

My parents, Ervin and Shirley Smalcel, have always had great confidence in me, which has given me strength when I needed it the most; for that I gratefully acknowledge them. Finally, Mark Pederson was my solid anchor through the ups and downs of this degree and thesis; I thank him with all of my heart for his support, encouragement and love.

Kristine Smalcel Pederson

Edmonton, Alberta
22 April, 1994

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter One:	Introduction: Language as the Foundation of a Slovene Identity	1 - 19
Chapter Two:	The Agrarian Question to 1848	20 - 40
Chapter Three:	1848 and the Peasant Issue at the Constitutional Parliament	41 - 75
Chapter Four:	Budding Nationalism and the Kavcic Federal Proposal	76 - 95
Chapter Five:	Conclusion	96 - 104
Bibliography		105 - 118

Chapter One: Introduction: Language as the Foundation of a Slovene Identity

> With the cultivation of the vernacular and history, the native literature and national relics, there was aroused in the people a love of country.[1]
>
> - Dragotin Loncar, Slovene Historian

Before 1848 in Austrian Cisleithania there was no collective national consciousness among the Habsburg Slavs who are now known as Slovenes. Important groundwork for Slovene nationalism was laid, however, in the centuries before the revolutions of 1848-1849. The single most important development, crucial to Slovene identity, was the establishment of a unified written Slovene language. The main architects of this written language were intellectuals who were influenced by enlightenment ideas about individuals, nations and, most importantly, languages. It was the written language which eventually brought the Slovenes together, enabled them to recognize and develop common cultural traits and to fight to have them preserved.

Before 1800, the Slovene people did not have a collective memory of political unity.[2] After this time, romanticism was used by intellectuals in the form of myth-making and fact-embellishing about ancient unity. The purpose of these actions was to enhance the cultivation of nationalism and alter the collective memory of the Slovene people.[3] Before the period of nationalism the pervasiveness of the feudal system of allegiance was very strong. People identified with their local lords, and then provinces, rather than with ethnic identity. Slovene people were scattered among the Austrian provinces of Carniola, Carinthia, Styria, Venetia and the Coastal Province, including the administrations of Istria, Gorica and Trieste. Some Slovenes lived within the borders of Hungary. It is not surprising that provincial loyalties would make it difficult to see common ground among people who lived in such "a labyrinth of seemingly disarrayed social and ethnic parts."[4]

---

[1] Dragotin Loncar, **The Slovenes: A Social History (From the Earliest Times to 1910)** (Cleveland, 1939), p. 56.

[2] Collective memory refers to a time of "remembered Slovene unity," passed down through the generations.

According to an official 1846 census of the Austrian lands, there were: 428,000 Slovenes (including a small number of Serbo-Croatians) who represented 92 per cent of the total population in Carniola; 363,000 (36 per cent) in Styria; 116,000 (approximately 36 per cent) in Carinthia (revised statistics); 128,000 (67 per cent) in Gorica (Görz); 25,000 (31.5 per cent) in Trieste; and, 32,000 (14 per cent) in Istria. In addition, 27,000 Slovenes lived in the province of Venetia (which belonged to the Habsburgs until 1866) and 45,000 Slovenes lived in parts of Istria and Hungary that were added in 1867.[5]

With the first modern instance of a written Slovene language, confusion about the similarities and differences between Slavs due to the strength of provincialism was evident. The Slovene Primoz Trubar (1508-1586) was a strong leader in the Protestant reformation. He published books in the language of the Slavic peasants in his home area, which was in the centre of Slovene settlements.[6] Even before Trubar's contribution to the Slovene language during the Protestant reformation, a Slovene dialect had been used in written form. The Freising Monuments, which are the oldest known records of a Slavic language recorded in the Latin alphabet, were written in a Slovene dialect. They were discovered in a Munich library in 1807, but are dated from 975 to 1025, and are considered to be copies of much older originals.[7]

---

[3] For a discussion on the origins, types and meaning of romanticism, see Roland N. Stromberg, **European Intellectual History since 1789** (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1981), pp. 36-49.

[4] Stanley Z. Pech, "The Nationalist Movements of the Austrian Slavs in 1848," **Histoire Sociale/Social History** (Vol. IX, No. 18, 1976), p. 338.

[5] Fran Zwitter, "The Slovenes and the Habsburg Monarchy," **Austrian History Yearbook** (Vol. III, 1967, Pt. 2), p. 159.

The first modern Slovene book was published by Trubar around 1550.[8] Although he made an important contribution to Slovene nationalism, Trubar was not nationally motivated to write in the people's language. He wrote in Slovene so that peasants in his home region, the majority of whom could not read Latin or German, would be better able to understand and participate in the new Protestant religion.[9] Despite the pragmatic purpose of his writings, the language that Trubar chose to use as the basis for his published works was not simply the codification of his home dialect. It combined the elements of the two most extensive and central Slovene dialects and resulted in an understandable language for the majority of Slovenes.[10] Yet Trubar and other Protestant writers were not completely sure about the unity of the Slavs. They understood that the various Slovene dialects were distinct from German, Italian and Hungarian, but how different they were from other, near-by Slavic dialects, like the Croatian and Dalmatian dialects, was not clear.[11]

---

[6] Bogdan C. Novak, "At the Roots of Slovene National Individuality," **Papers in Slovene Studies** (New York, 1975), pp. 81-82.

[7] Joze Pogacnik, "Das Schicksal der Freisinger Denkmäler in der Slawistik," **Freisinger Denkmäler** (Munich, 1968), pp. 3-4.

[8] See Trubar's "Catechismus" and "Abecedarium" in **Slovenski protestantski pisci** (Ljubljana, 1934), which are reprinted on pp. 1-8; Mirko Rupel, "Das erste slowenische Buch," **Primus Truber: Leben und Werk des slowenischen Reformators** (Munich, 1965), pp. 73-93; and Gerhard Neweklowsky, "Trubars Katechismus von 1550 -- eine Konkordanz," **Protestantismus bei den Slowenen** (Vienna, 1984), p. 133.

[9] Rupel, **Primus Truber: Leben und Werk**, p. 85.

Trubar and other Protestant writers used words like slovenski, slouenzi and windisch to refer to the Slavs they were writing for. This is illustrated by the main title of Trubar's first work, Catechismus In der Windischenn Sprach.[12] Most historians agree, however, that at this point in time, the Protestant writers referred to Slavic peoples in general rather than the modern sense of the term Slovene in most of their references concerning the peasants.[13] In fact, the name Slovene was originally a generic name for Slavs. The common slavonic form slovene meant "people of the same speech." Among Slavs, nemcy generally meant "Germans," or "people unable to speak," referring to the Germanic tribes who were the western neighbours of the Slavs.[14]

---

[10] Jakob Rigler, **Zacetki slovenskega knjiznega jezika: The Origins of the Slovene Literary Language** (Ljubljana, 1968), p. 246.

[11] ibid., pp. 247-252; other Slovene Protestant reformers who wrote and published in the Slovene language include Jurij Dalmatin, Adam Bohoric and Sebastijan Krelj. Examples of their works can be found in **Slovenski protestantski pisci**.

[12] In Trubar's Catechism, he referred to the Slovene language, in German, as the "windischen" language: "Catechismus In der Windischenn Sprach," Rupel, **Primus Truber: Leben und Werk**, p. 84.

[13] Novak, "Roots of Slovene National Individuality," **Papers in Slovene Studies**, pp. 84-85; and Rado L. Lencek, **The Structure and History of the Slovene Language** (Columbus, Ohio, 1982), p. 23.

[14] Peter Hill, "Nation, Nationality and Multiculturalism in Europe," **Australian Slavonic and East European Studies** (Vol. 4, Nos. 1-2, 1990), pp. 196-197; and Lencek, **Structure and History of the Slovene Language**, pp. 22-23.

Much of the progress made by the Protestant reformation's development of the Slovene written language and any subsequent unifying forces on the Slovene people were reversed by the counter-reformation. This was accomplished by wholesale destruction of Slovene books and severe restrictions on the printing of material for the masses.[15] Nonetheless, Trubar's and other Slovene reformers' contributions to the written language were important to the development of Slovene nationalism. Slovene intellectuals of the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries used the Protestant language versions as springboards for their own updated, enhanced and secularized versions of a unified written language.[16]

While the religious counter-reformation movement hindered development of Slovene consciousness and unity, the secular enlightenment did the opposite by introducing new ideas that promoted interest in the importance of individuals and nations. Intellectual interest in vernacular languages and in the history of modern peoples eventually led to interest in Slovene "national" history and language. Slovene intellectuals like Jernij Kopitar (1780-1844) were inspired by Herder's philosophy about language and the idea that folk-speech could be created and revitalized into a written language.[17] This type of influence helped spur the quest for a unified

---

[15] Martin Dimnik, "Gutenberg, Humanism, the Reformation, and the Emergence of the Slovene Literary Language, 1550-1584," **Canadian Slavonic Papers** (Vol. XXVI, Nos. 2 & 3, 1984), p. 159.

[16] Rado L. Lencek, "The Enlightenment's Interest in Languages and the National Revival of the South Slavs," **Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism** (Vol. X, No. 1, 1983) pp. 120-121.

[17] ibid., pp. 124-125; see also, Rado L. Lencek, "On Slavic Heritage in Slovene Culture," **Papers in Slovene Studies** (New York, 1975), p. 154.

Slovene language while the enlightened secular reforms of the late-eighteenth century aided additional cultural entrenchment.

It should be noted at this point, however, that the clergy played a very important role, along with enlightened secular intellectuals, in language and national development throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.[18] Their involvement in education, and the predominance of religion in the everyday life of the peasants, cannot be underestimated. The unawakened peasants were still the bulk of the Slovene population in 1848, but their awakening occurred fairly rapidly after the revolution. The clergy acted as catalysts in the trickle-down movement of ideas from the intellectuals to the peasants. Without their involvement, the national development of the Slovenes may have taken a very different direction.[19]

During the reigns of Maria Theresa and her son Joseph II (1740-1790), enlightenment ideas influenced the crown to make changes within the Habsburg monarchy. These changes, in turn, affected the development of Slovene nationalism. The enlightened Habsburg monarchs attempted to make their empire more efficient through the centralization of administration and general modernization of the economy. Development of industry and agriculture created the need for new training in these areas, and the easing of peasant obligations enabled the peasants to devote more time to general learning. Although some of these agricultural reforms were reversed after the death of Joseph II, peasants still had more personal freedom than before. As well, the new ideas about ethnic awareness acted as catalysts in the formation of national consciousness.[20]

---

[18] Anton Slodnjak, "Über die nationbildene Kraft der Reformation bei den Slowenen," **Abhandlungen über die Slowenische Reformation** (Munich, 1968), pp. 17-18.

[19] Novak, "Roots of Slovene National Individuality," **Papers in Slovene Studies**, p. 99.

Religion and nationalism have continued to play a very important role among the Slovenes. See Carole Rogel, **The Slovenes and Yugoslavism, 1890-1914** (Boulder, 1977). Rogel's essays highlight the important role of religion in politics at the turn of the century.

One of the leading parties in the first year of Slovenia's recent independence from Yugoslavia was the Christian Democratic Party. That party was accused of remaining "loyal to the 'principles of Slovenian clericalism'," a link to turn-of-the century politics. See Milan Andrejevich, "Hard Times Ahead for Croatia and Slovenia," **Report on Eastern Europe** (Vol. 2, No. 30, 1991), p. 46.

Before this period, when peasants moved into the cities they became Germanized. This was, however, a reflection of class distinctions rather than conscious national choice. Merchants, burghers and craftsmen were "German," therefore to function in the towns and cities one had to become "German."[21] After enlightenment ideas were incorporated into government policy, the ethnic flavour of urban centres gradually began to change. The remembrance and maintenance of one's Slavic heritage became more acceptable and was practiced more often. This is important in the discussion of nineteenth century nationalism since the Slovene "awakeners"[22] of that century came from urban settings, or were at least exposed to the urban culture through education.[23]

---

[20] Toussaint Hocevar, "Economic Determinants in the Development of the Slovene National System," **Papers in Slovene Studies** (New York, 1975), p. 29 and p. 47.

[21] A.J.P. Taylor, **The Habsburg Monarchy, 1809-1918** (London, 1951), pp. 23-25. See also, Hocever, "Economic Determinants," **Papers in Slovene Studies**, p. 36. Hocevar argues that underneath the German exterior there existed an underlying Slovene culture in towns and cities in the Slovene regions. This is difficult to prove or disprove, but conscious nationalism was not evident anywhere among Slovenes until the nineteenth century.

[22] To be "awakened" means to become aware of one's nationality, to be interested in its further development and to seek to have closer ties with the people who are of the same ethnic background.

[23] Robert A. Kann, **The Multinational Empire, Volume I: Empire and Nationalities** (New York, 1950), p. 297.

Maria Theresa and Joseph II implemented educational reforms as part of their effort to centralize the bureaucracy of the monarchy and these reforms affected virtually everyone in the empire. To facilitate administration within the monarchy, wide use of the German language was encouraged. In order to shape an empire to become focused in the centre, rather than in the individual provinces and regions, a basic form of common communication had to be established. As a by-product of this process, a unified Slovene language and the seeds of Slovene nationalism were inadvertently cultivated, developed and dispersed to meet the crown's goal.[24] Education became an important factor in the development of Slovene nationalism: by 1910, the predominantly illiterate Slovene population of the late-eighteenth century had a literacy rate of 86 per cent.[25]

In formal education, concessions were initially made by the central government to allow more use of Slavic languages in the early years of schooling in order to involve most of the population in their reforms. The use of Slavic languages was only meant to be used as a stepping stone to German, but in the process, a unified Slovene language was eventually developed and enhanced. Slavic peasant children could not function well when completely immersed in the German language from the beginning of formal education, so it was decided that they should begin their schooling in their native tongue. Ideally, as they became familiar with general schooling practices in their own language, instruction and learning in German could be intensified. The end result was supposed to be a population that was functional in both written and oral German.[26]

---

[24] Novak, "Roots of Slovene National Individuality," **Papers in Slovene Studies**, p. 87.

[25] Toussaint Hocevar, **The Structure of the Slovenian Economy, 1848-1963** (New York, 1965), p. 51. Among Slovenes who were born in the 1830s, it is estimated that a 27% literacy rate existed. See Pech, "The Nationalist Movements of the Austrian Slavs," **Histoire Sociale/Social History**, p. 346.

Textbooks and other materials in Slovene were needed for this early schooling, and therefore a Slovene written language had to be codified. This led to debates about which dialects should be used, what type of new letters should be introduced to help sophisticate the language and other such details. Provincialism was an important factor in these debates and many of the intellectuals who were involved in the Slovene language debate still did not recognize a unified Slavic population. The result was the publication of different Slovene dialects. By the beginning of the nineteenth century, however, a delicate consensus had been reached among Slovene intellectuals on what to base the literary language. Since dialects had evolved even further apart than in the sixteenth century, a unified written language based on current dialects was difficult to create.[27] The solution was to use the sixteenth century standard form as the basis for the contemporary version of the modern literary language. To accommodate a more sophisticated usage of the language, compatible additions from other languages were made.

An example of devising solutions of compromise to the language problem is Jernij Kopitar's book, Grammatik der Slawischen Sprache in

---

[26] "The emperor was deeply convinced that the German language of administration and instruction served the best interests of all of his subjects irrespective of their nationality. Yet he held to that view not only because the knowledge of German among the educated classes was more widespread than any other ..., he believed also that German culture was superior to any other." Robert A. Kann, **A History of the Habsburg Empire, 1526-1918** (Berkeley, 1974), pp. 185-186.

[27] Lencek, **Structure and History of the Slovene Language**, p. 156.

Krain, Kärnten und Steyermark.[28] The work was written in German, which was a common practice among Kopitar's contemporaries in Slavic studies. Kopitar is recognized as an important Slovene scholar, but it is not well known that he clashed frequently with other Slovene intellectuals. Kopitar was in fact a state censor in Vienna from 1810 to 1848 and was a staunch defender of conservatism, monarchical institutions and their power. He promoted the development of the Slovene language for the betterment of the empire, not for the divisive ends of nationalism.[29]

While much effort was expended in developing rudimentary language materials, Slovene primary education was certainly not the sole concern of intellectuals. As early as 1786, there was a call for a modern university in Ljubljana (Laibach), with instruction in Slovene.[30] It was argued that the university would be an ideal training ground for bureaucrats who had to deal with the public. Germanizing interests won out, however, and the plan was turned down. As Robert A. Kann has pointed out, neither the empress nor her son were overly concerned with the development of higher education in the realm. A mainly Slovene university did not fit the centralist plans of the monarchy. Most importantly, it would be an expensive undertaking that was not deemed essential to the empire.[31]

---

[28] J. Kopitar, **Grammatik der Slawischen Sprache in Krain, Kärnten und Steyermark** (reprint of original 1808 edition; Munich, 1970).

[29] Rogel, **Slovenes and Yugoslavism**, pp. 10-11.

[30] Hocevar, "Economic Determinants," **Papers in Slovene Studies**, p. 43.

[31] Kann, **A History of the Habsburg Empire**, p. 192.

Ethnic Slovene intellectuals had previously been Germanized, both linguistically and culturally; therefore the new interest in language had an important impact on the later formation of a Slovene nationality. Reaching back to regional histories in order to define and give meaning to their personal identities, intellectuals helped define the emergence of a Slovene nation. Until after 1848, however, Slovene intellectuals largely functioned in German, while only researching the limitations and extent of Slovene language and culture. Nonetheless, they did think of themselves as Slovenes rather than Germans, which was an important step.

This type of Slovene self-identification was aided by the brief French occupation of Slovene territories at the beginning of the nineteenth century. From the Slovene nationalist point of view, the Napoleonic era has generally been regarded in a positive light. The main Slovene territories (representing about half of the Slovene population), along with some Croatian and Dalmatian regions, were occupied by Napoleon's forces in 1809. The area was used as an outpost of defence and possible base for further expansion south. While French was the language of the upper level of administration, the use of Slovene was allowed at the local level of public administration.[32]

During the existence of the so-called Illyrian Provinces (1809-1813) the Slovene language was used extensively, which contributed to its preservation and development. Initially, the French administration planned to use the Dubrovnik dialect of Croatian as the official Slavic language of the province. Kopitar and another Slovene intellectual, Valentin Vodnik, argued strongly for the Slovene case and won the right to have "Slovene" as one of the two official languages, enhancing the individuality of the language. "Serbian" was designated as the second official language.[33]

---

[32] Zwitter, "The Slovenes," **Austrian History Yearbook**, pp. 163-164.

Slovene was used as one of the primary languages of instruction in elementary and lower secondary schools during the French occupation. It was also permitted as a subject of study in the upper Gymnasium (high school). During this brief period of history, public use of the word "Slovene" became common. The discovery of the Freising Monuments and other older instances of the Slovene written language aided in this strengthening of Slovene national self-confidence. Despite the loss of most of the newly acquired public language rights during the Austrian restoration, the memory of these rights aided the cultivation of the Slovene national identity.[34]

Although public use of the language was not overwhelmingly encouraged in the restoration period, Slovene cultural development was not discouraged as much as it had been before Napoleon's occupation. In fact, it has been observed that Vienna outwardly supported some Slovene cultural activities, including language use, during the Vormärz.[35] One of the conservative Slovene leaders, Kopitar, was a strong supporter of Catholic Austroslavism. Since this concept and Kopitar himself were acceptable to the central administration, Austro-Slavic efforts were cautiously permitted to continue.[36] Part of this idea of Austroslavism included Kopitar's notion of two main south Slavic languages within the Habsburg monarchy: "Carantanian" (Slovene) for the Slovenes and the kajkavian[37] Croats, and "Serbian" for the remaining Croats and Serbs.[38]

---

[33] Novak, "Roots of Slovene National Individuality," **Papers in Slovene Studies**, pp. 91-92.

[34] See Carole Rogel, "The Slovenes in the Revolutionary Period," **Consortium on Revolutionary Europe. Proceedings, Volume I** (1972), pp. 264-274.

[35] Vormärz refers to the period of Austrian history from 1815 to the March revolution of 1848.

[36] Kann, **A History of the Habsburg Empire**, pp. 297-298.

From the Napoleonic Era until 1848, the use of romanticism in Slovene cultural activities was central to the creation of a national consciousness.[39] The conservative Kopitar was often at odds with Slovene romanticists, such as France Preseren, one of Slovene's greatest poets. Preseren wanted to free the Slovene population, especially the middle and upper classes, from dependence on the German language. It was a goal that Metternich (and therefore Kopitar) was not in favour of because it was at odds with the centralization goals of the monarchy.[40] Kopitar was not completely immune to nationalism, however, as his defence of the Slovene language in the Napoleonic era shows. His was a unique combination of "Austro-Slavic romantic nationalism."[41] Along with promotion of the language for all Slovenes, romanticists used myth-making to establish a basis for unification of the Slovene people.

---

[37] For a definition of "kajkavian" dialects, see Lencek, **Structure and History of the Slovene Language**, pp. 22-23.

[38] Austroslavism played a major part in 1848-1849; the Slavic delegates to the constitutional parliament advocated solutions to their problems within Austria, not outside. See Kann, **The Multinational Empire, Volume II**, pp. 6-7.

[39] "'A nation', wrote Ernest Renan in a famous definition, 'is the common memory of great things done jointly by our ancestors, along with the desire to remain united in order to do yet more of them.' The nation, in brief, is a literary creation." Stromberg, **European Intellectual History since 1789**, p. 188.

[40] Rogel, **Slovenes and Yugoslavism**, pp. 10-11.

[41] Eduard Winter, **Romantismus, Restauration und Frühliberalismus im österreichischen Vormärz** (Vienna, 1968), p. 176.

In order to help facilitate unity and a sense of commonalty in this period, Slovene nationalists of the early-nineteenth century began to highlight the rule of Carantania as the last instance of Slovene unity and political independence.[42] Carantania was a tribal state encompassing the lands of the alpine Slavs (roughly coinciding with the ethnic boundaries of present-day Slovenes) in the seventh and eighth centuries. By the mid-eighth century, the Franks had overtaken the territory and it was subsequently conquered and divided by other powers, including the Habsburgs. While other contemporary ethnic groups, like the Croats or the Serbs, could recall relatively recent instances of political ethnic unity, the Slovenes had no such example. As historians of both the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have been so fond of saying, the Slovenes were a non-historic people. They did not have a "history," so they created a medieval one.

The existence of Carantania is certainly indisputable, but it is questionable whether the Slavs of that territory thought of themselves as united Slavs (Slovenes) and shared their memories with future generations after their state was dismantled. Seemingly far-fetched, the strength of this argument cannot, however, be underestimated. The unity of Carantania is still discussed today, by modern Slovene historians and linguists in their discussions on Slovene history.[43] Nonetheless, whether it is true or not, it was useful in the nineteenth century, and perhaps still is, in developing and retaining a national consciousness. Since the unifying ideas of Slovene romantic nationalists were spread to city-dwellers as well as rural peasants, the effects of this myth-making are incalculable.

---

[42] Loncar, **The Slovenes: A Social History**, p. 15.

[43] See Lencek, **Structure and History of the Slovene Language**, p. 39: "The formation of Slavic Karantania in the Eastern Alps was certainly a socially most relevant native impulse which might have had a powerful influence on the early development of Slovene ethnic individuality had it preserved its independent political character some centuries longer."

Another feature of romanticism in the early to mid-nineteenth century was an increase in Slovene literature. Peasants of the eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries were initially exposed to Slovene literary works by priests who wrote songs, short stories and similar popular items. Due to the poor quality of clerical training, the literary quality of these pieces was not very high, but the exposure they provided to a more sophisticated language was valuable. By the 1840s, more formal religious works in Slovene were being used to target the masses. An example of this is Martin Slomsek's composition of a Sunday school reader in 1842.[44]

Preseren and other secular, liberal intellectuals also wrote works in Slovene, but their main concern was elevating the Slovene language to a higher level. They wanted to make it suitable for literature and teaching by intellectuals and the emerging middle class in place of German. Some of the works of this kind are considered to be of high literary value.[45] Although different levels of sophistication were achieved, and different audiences targeted, all of the early-nineteenth century compositions in Slovene were important in developing a sense of unity.

Toward the mid-nineteenth century, cultural progress and bureaucratic tolerance had advanced to the point where Slovene publications appeared more frequently. One literary journal, Kranjska Cbelica (1830-1848), catered to the interests of Slovene intellectuals, while in the 1840s, more popular-based reading materials emerged. The newspaper, Kmetijske in rokodelske novice (Peasant and Craftsman News), later simply called Novice, had a publishing life from 1843-1902.[46] It was initially published by the conservative Slovene awakener, Janez Bleiweis.[47] Bleiweis played an important role in the development of Slovene nationalism, but he was cautious about it. Despite often being accused of enjoying over-friendly relationships with the German bureaucracy, he was a Slovene at heart. He even declined to compete for a parliamentary seat because he did not want to be seen as a "Deutschtümler."[48]

---

[44] Novak, "Roots of Slovene National Individuality," **Papers in Slovene Studies**, p. 94.

[45] Rogel, **Slovenes and Yugoslavism**, p. 10.

Attesting to its wide appeal, of the total 1522 subscribers to Novice in 1847, there were 689 clergymen and 230 peasants.[49] Intellectuals were almost certainly readers as well. Complementing the adult-based reading material, several children's journals were published around 1848. It has been observed that, especially after 1848, these children's journals "made an issue of patriotism and the right to use the mother tongue, while vigorously defending the minority rights of the Slovenian people."[50]

During the period 1815-1848, two main factors threatened Slovene unity: disputes over spelling and vocabulary of the written Slovene language; and the threat of a Slavic merger with the Croatian people, to form a common Illyrian identity. Both of these threats served to reinforce the defence of the Slovene language and therefore its ties to a unique and individual Slovene culture. Intellectuals debated which dialects should be used and what direction to take in expanding the language. The introduction of new letters seemed necessary to most intellectuals, in order to create a language which could be used for literature and intellectual discussions, but which type of letters to use was also an issue. Most agreed that keeping the language as Slavic as possible was desirable, but how to do that without making the language "croaticized," for example, was an important problem.[51]

---

[46] ibid., p. 13.

[47] See the entry for Janez Bleiweis, **Slovenski Biografski Leksikon, Volume I** (reprint of the original 1932 edition; Liechtenstein, 1976), p. 43.

[48] ibid., p. 45.

[49] Bogo Grafenauer, **Zgodovina slovenskega naroda, Volume 5** (Ljubljana, 1962), p. 165.

[50] Christa Kamenetsky, "Folklore Revival in Slovenia: A Quest for Cultural Identity," **School Library Journal** (May 1974), p. 1442.

The second and related threat to Slovene unity was the Illyrian possibility, which entailed a union with the Croatian people and a submersion of Slovene language and individuality. Some intellectuals supported this Pan-Slavic idea, while others were less interested. Support for this idea often depended on the intellectuals' proximity to the threat of German assimilation. For those Slovene intellectuals living in German-dominated, or at least split-ethnic regions (e.g. Carinthia, Styria), the idea of a Pan-Slavic union was far more desirable than for those Slovene intellectuals who were not as immediately threatened with assimilation (e.g. those in Carniola).[52]

The majority of Slovene intellectuals, including Kopitar, Preseren and Slomsek, refused to accept the idea of a merger. According to Charles Jelavich, "South Slav unity was not a major issue for a people who needed to take the first steps toward asserting their national identity."[53] They banded together, instead, to defend the Slovene literary language. In the 1830s and 1840s, Kopitar's Austro-Slavic vision of two different Slavic languages within the Habsburg monarchy was used as a basis for opposition to this Croat-led Illyrian movement. Strong opposition ensured that Illyrianism failed to dominate the Slovene lands. Slovene leaders like Preseren and Kopitar disagreed on many issues of Slovene nationalism, including the purpose of a Slovene language. They did, however, agree that the Slovenes should be allowed to develop their own language and culture, and not merely become "Illyrians."[54]

---

[51] Novak, "Roots of Slovene National Individuality," **Papers in Slovene Studies**, pp. 96-97.

[52] ibid., p. 97-98.

The decade before the revolution of 1848-1849 marked the first publication of the previously mentioned newspaper, Novice. It was an important factor in overcoming the Illyrian threat by printing discussions of the Illyrian merger and by solidifying the use of Slovene. The newspaper also contributed to the broadening of language acceptability and was a major public forum for experimenting with, and debating the use of, different forms of Slovene.[55] With the increasing use and discussion of a united Slovene language, the idea of publicly recognizing a united Slovene people and acting upon nationalistic instincts was not far off.

The year 1848 was a very important one for the Slovenes, because it marked the launching of a nationality. Foundations for Slovene nationalism were laid before 1848, but the mass of the population, the peasants, were not awakened until after the revolutionary period. The bourgeois intellectuals, influenced by enlightenment ideas, helped launch the revolution in 1848, and were themselves reflections of how developed Slovene nationalism was at that point in time. Although most of the Slovene intellectuals were aware of ethnic unity by 1848, only a few ardent nationalists existed. The majority had divided loyalties between liberalism and their class, nationalism and their peasantry.

---

[53] Charles Jelavich, **South Slav Nationalisms: Textbooks and Yugoslav Union before 1914** (Columbus, 1990), p. 28.

[54] Rogel, **Slovenes and Yugoslavism**, p. 12.

[55] Lencek, **Structure and History of the Slovene Language**. See footnote 10, pp. 259-260.

The constitutional parliament of 1848-1849 is an excellent example of where the Slovenes were as a nationality in the mid-nineteenth century.[56] The main issue of concern for all Slovenes was the peasant issue, since almost the entire population was still involved in agriculture in 1848. Slovene peasants were primarily interested in improving their socio-economic situation; therefore, studying the agrarian issue is central to discovering who the Slovenes were on the eve of their full awakening. Even the Slovene bourgeois intellectual liberals showed unusual sensitivity toward the issue. It was the one issue discussed at the parliament in which the full Slovene delegation participated. Secondary in importance during 1848 was the idea of Slovene political unity -- an issue that was also debated by members of parliament, but not yet at the forefront of Slovene interest. The agrarian issue represented the Slovene past while the idea of Slovene unity was the issue of the future. The meeting point for these two important topics in Slovene history was the Vienna/Kremsier parliament of 1848-1849 which will be the focus of this thesis.

---

[56] The parliament is known as the Vienna/Kremsier Parliament; it was convened in Vienna in July, 1848, but was moved to the small town of Kremsier after the October revolution in the capital city. It remained in its new location until the parliament was closed in March, 1849.

Chapter Two: The Agrarian Question to 1848

The Austrian revolution of 1848-1849 would not have happened without the very important peasant issue. During the revolutionary period, the peasant issue captivated the attention of the entire monarchy from the crown down to the most obscure peasant household. Without it there would not have been concessions from the central government to have a constitutional parliament. At the revolutionary parliament in 1848-1849, the peasant question was the only legislated issue which outlasted the revolution. All other decisions that were made at the parliament, including the proposed reorganization of the monarchy, were ignored by the neo-absolutist government in 1849. The agrarian issue is, therefore, an important topic to examine. The parliament showcased the decades-long struggles of whether the peasants' obligations should finally be completely dissolved and how the process to achieve that end should be carried out.

Throughout the first half of the nineteenth century, the Austrian central government continued, at least superficially, in the enlightenment tradition. The need for agrarian reform was acknowledged, but fear of change paralyzed the government.[1] The government recognized that a peasantry free of the Robot (labour service) and other obligations had advantages for the crown. But it wanted to avoid confrontational repercussions that might result from such changes and lead to its reduced authority.

---

[1] Regarding the enlightenment reforms of the eighteenth century, see Edith Murr Link, **The Emancipation of the Austrian Peasant, 1740-1798** (New York, 1949).

Although peasant obligations varied from province to province, a general list can be assembled, as follows: 1) the labour service (*Robot*); 2) the tithe, in kind (*Zehent*); 3) lesser dues in labour, kind and cash; 4) money payments when holdings were transferred; 5) compulsory labour of orphans; 6) obligations to the state; 7) obligations to the church. During the first half of the nineteenth century, peasant obligations were due not only to landowners, but also to the state, the church and urban corporations. The estimated total share of net income that the peasant kept was between 15 and 30 per cent.[2] Peasants were subjects of their landlords who had limited powers over them. In return for the lord allowing the peasants to live on and use his land, the peasant paid various dues, including the *Robot*, to the landowner.

Improved economic benefits and loyalty of the peasantry were the most specific gains the crown hoped to receive from the changes they had been considering, but they were unsure how the nobles would fit into the equation. Nobles of various distinctions were not the only landowners, but they were the majority. In this essay, the terms "nobles" and "lords" refer to landowners in general, but nobles in particular -- including the church, which was also a great landowner. A sample of land ownership in the wine-producing Slovene territory of Jeruzalemske Gorice in the year 1824 included noble landowners (and lower gentry), ecclesiastical institutions as well as city-dwellers, non-resident peasants and resident peasants.[3] When the time for change came in 1848, the crown was still reluctant to acknowledge agreement with the small but vocal number of noble landowners who had been pressuring the central government for decades to reform agriculture.

---

[2] See Jerome Blum, **Noble Landowners and Agriculture in Austria 1815-1848** (Baltimore, 1948), p. 71; and John-Paul Himka, **Galician Villagers and the Ukrainian National Movement in the Nineteenth Century** (Edmonton/London, 1988), pp. 1-2. Discussing the Austrian peasant in general, Blum has estimated that before 1846, the peasant kept 30 per cent of his net income; Himka has pointed out that the Galician peasant in particular, during the years 1819-1820, kept only 15 per cent of his net income.

The historian Jerome Blum is the greatest advocate of the idea that there were reform-minded noble landowners during the Vormärz period.[4] This theory is not a conclusive one, especially when one considers the vast differences among the Austrian provinces, but it is worth considering. The Habsburg monarchy marked the transition from western to eastern Europe and represented characteristics of both progressive westernization and entrenched eastern feudalism. Although it was considered to be an absolutist state from the early modern era into the modern, its absolutism was tempered by enlightenment ideals. By the nineteenth century, its regions were inhabited by peasantries who "did not constitute an undifferentiated rural mass: the distinctions in their condition were of considerable importance."[5]

Key to this distinction between peasantries were the attitudes of the land-holding classes. Nobility everywhere in the monarchy must be regarded as fundamentally conservative in the nineteenth century. For example, despite the final abolition of serfdom in 1848, the Kingdom of Galicia retained strong vestiges of feudalism until the late-nineteenth century.[6] Components of feudalism were entrenched in agriculture and were extremely difficult to replace, even after more than one hundred years of legal reforms. "Objectionable as manorial serfdom might be ... (except, of course, to the noble and ecclesiastical lords who profited from it), it was rooted in long practice and would not be easily undone by advocates of innovation."[7]

---

[3] See Borut Belec, "Zemljiskoposestne razmere v jeruzalemskih goricah leta 1824," **Casopis za zgodovino in narodopisje** (Year 41, Vol. 6., 1970), pp. 67-69.

[4] Blum, **Noble Landowners**, pp. 239-246 and; Jerome Blum, **The End of the Old Order in Rural Europe** (Princeton, 1978), p. 317.

[5] Perry Anderson, **Lineages of the Absolutist State**, (London, 1989), pp. 300-301.

It is in the most eastern province of Austria (Galicia) that Blum's thesis is least applicable. Specialists in this area have shown that Blum's generalities concerning reform-minded noble landowners cannot be applied to Galicia. In the pre-1848 era, Galician landowners clung to their feudal rights with tenacity, impervious to reforming trends that were beginning to influence landowners in the western provinces.[8]

Yet Blum's suggestions can be used to look at the western provinces. Specifically, but not only, regarding the Slovene lands, one can discuss fundamental differences that made western provinces more susceptible to reform among landowners than Austria's eastern lands. French administration of much of the Slovene territory during the Napoleonic era failed to completely eradicate feudalism, but the spirit of change cannot be underestimated. An integral part of the Code Napoléon, the basis of French rule everywhere, was the intention to end feudalism.[9] Despite the reimposition of Austrian law after a very short period of time, the French occupation was crucial in nurturing seeds of reform that were planted in the Josephine era.[10]

---

[6] Himka, **Galician Villagers**, pp. 146-147.

[7] William E. Wright, **Serf, Seigneur, and Sovereign: Agrarian Reform in Eighteenth-Century Bohemia** (Minneapolis, 1966), p. 155.

[8] See Himka, **Galician Villagers**, pp. 1-16, for a view of Galician landowners in the pre-1848 era.

[9] Rogel, "Slovenes in the Revolutionary Period," **Consortium**, pp. 265-266.

While other parts of the empire slipped back into pre-reform habits, the Illyrian province was exposed to an extended period of change. Although Napoleon's central administration had clear mandates regarding agriculture, the way in which the policies were implemented in the provinces was not always as straightforward. The French reforms were not well orchestrated because of the various personal stamps administrators tended to put on their spheres of influence. Policies varied greatly, causing general confusion, but it was the peasants who were the most bewildered. Since they were traditionally apprehensive about all changes affecting them it is not surprising that they were as little supportive of the French agrarian reforms as they had initially been of the eighteenth-century reforms.[11] Despite the haphazard implementation of improvements and initial lack of peasant support, however, some amount of lasting change occurred.[12]

The French did not eliminate all noble privileges within their new sphere of influence, but they did initiate reforms of patrimony and land jurisdiction that were not altered after their retreat. Sergij Vilfan has shown that what was created by the French administration was something new and not unimportant to agrarian history.[13] The unrevoked reforms remained in force and did not collapse, as the Josephine reforms had in other parts of Austria at the end of the eighteenth century.[14]

---

[10] Kann, **A History of the Habsburg Empire**, pp. 284-285.

[11] Rogel, "Slovenes in the Revolutionary Period," **Consortium**, pp. 266-267.

[12] Joze Koropec, "Polskavska zemljiska gospostva," **Casopis za zgodovino in narodopisje**, (Year 51, Vol. 16, 1980), p. 60.

[13] Sergij Vilfan, "Die Agrarsozialpolitik von Maria Theresia bis Kudlich," **Der Bauer Mittel- und Osteuropas im sozio-ökonomischen Wandel des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts** (Cologne, 1973), p. 37.

Nobles, including some in the Slovene lands, were interested in getting rid of the Robot because its productivity was very low. This attitude was directly related to the promotion of western ideas about agriculture that were initially introduced by Maria Theresa and Joseph II, and were reinforced by the French occupation of Illyria.[15] A willingness to give up the Robot in western areas, like the Slovene lands, was balanced with heavy Zehent obligations, however, in order to maximize revenues.[16]

Despite the "pervasive net of repression"[17] in the Vormärz, independent economic development, including improvements to agriculture, was evident in the western part of the empire. Capitalization of the Habsburg empire's economy was first initiated in Bohemia, Silesia and Moravia, which contributed to reform-mindedness among landowners there.[18] In 1850, the estimated portion of the total population of Bohemia involved in agriculture was less than 60 per cent. This trend towards capitalization, industrialization and agricultural reform also existed in other western areas, but on a smaller scale. In Carniola, over 90 per cent of the population was still involved in agriculture in the year 1850, but by 1880 that number was down to around 76 per cent.[19] Despite the heavily agrarian nature of the Slovene lands, and the lack of industrialization before 1848, there were still elements of reform present. The French occupation of Illyria helped lay these foundations for capitalization of both agriculture and industry.[20]

---

[14] For an opposing view regarding Styria, a province that contained some Slovene peasants, but was not incorporated into Napoleon's Illyria, see Friedrich Lütge, "Die Grundentlastung (Bauernbefreiung) in der Steiermark," **Zeitschrift für Agrargeschichte und Agrarsoziologie**, (Year 16, 1968), pp. 190-209.

[15] M. Britovsek, **Razkroj fevdalne agrarne strukture na Kranjskem** (Ljubljana, 1964), p. 177 and following, as cited in Vilfan, "Die Agrarsozialpolitik," **Die Bauer Mittel- und Osteuropas**, p. 35 and p. 52.

[16] **Verhandlungen des österreichischen Reichstages nach der stenographischen Aufnahme, Volume I** (Vienna, 1848-1849), p. 423.

[17] David F. Good, **The Economic Rise of the Habsburg Empire, 1750-1914** (Berkeley, 1984), p. 39.

[18] Winter, **Romantismus, Restauration and Frühliberalismus**, pp. 119-122.

This economic reform was discussed in the provincial estates by landowners who were aggravated by their inability to secure changes in the agrarian social structure. By the 1840s, they were aggressively pursuing reinstatement of the provincial estates (diets) as institutions of true power, power they would gain at the expense of the centralized monarchy. The provincial estates had, until the centralizing work of Maria Theresa and Joseph II, been very powerful institutions. With the consolidation of absolutist power in Austria, these estates had become symbolic political houses only. The estates question was an important issue both before and during the revolution, including at the constitutional parliament.[21] The issue involved the long-time power struggle between the crown and the nobles, but it now also awakened the interest of the emerging nationalities (voiced by their liberal leaders), who favoured a decentralized government in order to secure their individual rights. The estates had traditionally been controlled by noble landowners, with only the diets of Tirol and Vorarlberg providing for direct representation of peasants before 1848.[22]

---

[19] Roman Sandgruber, **Österreichische Agrarstatistik, 1750-1918** (Munich, 1978), p. 222.

[20] Richard L. Rudolph, "Economic Revolution in Austria? The Meaning of 1848 in Austrian Economic History," **Economic Development in the Habsburg Monarchy in the Nineteenth Century: Essays** (Boulder, 1983), pp. 168-169.

[21] **Verhandlungen, Volume I**, pp. 452-454.

This push for renewed power of the estates even included some support from liberal members of the Estates of Lower Austria for admittance of peasants and burghers as equal members with nobles and clergy.[23] In an ironic twist, liberal nobles argued that the masses needed their interests protected from the central government -- a job that they, the landowners, and the estates were willing to take on.[24] Generous as this suggestion for political equality was, landowners were ultimately most interested in retaining their own economic privileges.

Viktor von Andrian-Werburg was one of the reform-minded nobles of the Lower Austrian Diet.[25] He wrote several treatises discussing these issues, which included an acknowledgment that Austrian agriculture needed to be changed. However, rather than blaming the agricultural problems on labour services like many others in the 1840s, Andrian-Werburg blamed the problems on an unfair system of taxation.[26] His view, reflecting the conflicting priorities between reform and conservative self-interest, was a common one among noble landowners. As early as 1843, however, the

---

[22] Kann, **The Multinational Empire, Volume I**, pp. 58-68.

[23] Link, **Emancipation of the Austrian Peasant**, p. 174.

[24] Viktor von Andrian-Werburg, **Oesterreich und dessen Zukunft** (Hamburg, 1843), pp. 199-200.

[25] Opposition to the central government "made itself felt in the Diet of Lower Austria where the more liberal elements of the lesser nobility began to form links with the middle-class intelligentsia." Peter Jones, **The 1848 Revolutions** (London, 1991), p. 69.

[26] Andrian-Werburg, **Oesterreich und dessen Zukunft** (1843), p. 115.

Lower Austrian Estates had asked for the removal of all dues and services paid by the peasants, in addition to requests for a reduction in taxes.[27]

The taxation issue was one that greatly concerned the large landholders, but it also concerned lesser tax-payers. Andreas Dominkus, a Styrian Slovene delegate to the parliament in 1848-1849, was a forester who falls into the latter category. At the parliament, his infrequent addresses to the house focused on the state of the tax system in Styria and Carniola.[28] Other non-Slovenes from the area also voiced concern about this issue.[29] Dominkus believed that those provinces would soon become impoverished, threatening the welfare of their people, if the cadasters (land registers) were not immediately revised.[30] Although the land surveys of the 1840s were more equitable than the ones in the past, they still favoured large landholders.[31] The Slovene forester's discontent with the burden of taxes did not seem to include a grudge against large landowners, however, since he endorsed compensation to landowners at the parliament in August of 1848.

The important place agricultural reform had taken in the decades preceding 1848 was demonstrated by the tax-dominated writings of Andrian-Werburg. His works are extremely detailed essays that focus on defending the economic position of the nobility. Had opposition to the ultra-conservative position not been building, especially within the nobility itself, it is unlikely that such defences would have been necessary. They acknowledged the necessity of some change by promoting the admittance of lesser classes to the estates. Andrian-Werburg was born in Gorica, near Tirol where a more progressive estates system existed.[32] The fact that peasants were members of the Tirolean estates may have influenced him to promote similar reforms in the Lower Austrian Diet.

---

[27] Rath, **Viennese Revolution of 1848** (Austin, 1957), p. 29.

[28] **Verhandlungen, Volume I**, p. 471 and **Volume II**, pp. 70-71

[29] **Verhandlungen, Volume I**, pp. 302-303.

[30] **Verhandlungen, Volume II**, pp. 95-96.

[31] Blum, **Noble Landowners**, pp. 254-255.

Clearly, noble landowners were aware of, and at least superficiously influenced by, liberal philosophy. Andrian-Werburg even included a documentation/petition arguing against government censors in the second volume of Oesterreich und dessen Zukunft. It was undersigned by nobles, academics and other liberal-minded individuals, including Dr. Ludwig von Löhner, an important figure in 1848-1849.[33] Momentum toward full reform, of which the petition is an example, forced landowners to take a more moderate stand on the agricultural issue. Ultimately, however, their positions depended on what they felt was the best way to preserve their positions of wealth and power.[34]

Some noble landowners recognized that the liberal values of liberty and equality would inevitably force them to treat their peasants much differently than they had in past generations. Hence one sees the concessions that Andrian-Werburg and others made in the decades before the 1848 uprisings. Despite these advances, however, most nobles were only able to see the short-term inconvenience of completely freeing the peasantry. The potential loss of revenue and power overshadowed the long-term benefits. They chose to disregard most of the discussion about the long-term benefits of drastic changes in agriculture, which was generated by the intelligentsia and a small, but growing, number of landowners. All of the nobles who were participating in the agricultural debate simply wanted to be more in control of their affairs, and they made this clear to the central administration in Vienna.[35]

---

[32] Kann refers to Andrian-Werburg as a former member of the Tirolean Estates, but his biography states only that he was a member of the Lower Austrian Estates and the Frankfurt National Assembly (1848-1849). See Kann, **The Multinational Empire, Volume I**, p. 60; and the entry for Andrian-Werburg in the **Österreichisches Biographisches Lexikon, Volume I** (Graz/Cologne, 1957), p. 22.

[33] Andrian-Werburg, **Oesterreich und dessen Zukunft. Zweiter Theil** (Hamburg, 1847), pp. 315-338.

[34] For an analysis of the Austrian nobles' economic position that is written in a more defensive tone -- with much more attention given to peasant obligations than in Volume I, see Andrian-Werburg's Volume II (**Zweiter Theil**), as above.

The government wanted nothing less than to yield power to the nobles. Because of this, an impasse between the two groups remained. When the crown finally did proclaim amendments to the status of the peasantry in the spring of 1848, the limited changes were made only in reaction to severe agitation by the masses, and as a power move to gain the peasantry's support against the nobles. The crown decreed changes that some of the nobles had been demanding, but they were not made to appease the landowners.[36]

Many nobles had wanted change for quite some time. By the nineteenth century, serfdom, even in the modified form that it had assumed in Austria, had ceased to be an economically viable method of land tenure. Although some progressive landowners, like Andrian-Werburg, had been greatly influenced by liberal ideas of equality and were interested in greater profits from their estates, they wanted more profits through the alteration of the tax system. The more progressive landowners believed that these new profits could be gained through a freer peasantry and favourable rental agreements, with a labour force based on hired rather than Robot labour.

---

[35] Andrian-Werburg, **Oesterreich und dessen Zukunft**, pp. 191-193.

[36] Roman Rosdolsky, **Die Bauernabgeordneten im konstituierenden österreichischen Reichstag, 1848-1849** (Vienna, 1976), pp. 23-41.

The debate surrounding the labour issue had been alive for many years before the revolutionary parliament. For example, an 1822 article in the influential agricultural journal, Oekonomische Neuigkeiten, cited evidence of the greater productivity of a freed peasantry in other parts of Europe to highlight the argument that agriculture could not begin to reach its full potential in Austria without free workers.[37] An even earlier example of this attitude can be found in an eighteenth century article published by the Carniolan Agricultural Society (k.k. Landwirtschafts-Gesellschaft, Krain). This article stated that benefits to agriculture from a free peasantry were not the only issues at stake. By forcing the peasants to work, one was violating their individual rights of freedom.[38]

One of the most debated agrarian issues involved the Robot, which was a peasant obligation of work to the lord in relation to the size of the peasant holdings. It was a method of forced labour with little incentive to be productive because it was a type of work based on a commitment of time, not on the task completed. A growing number of landowners were impressed with the innovations in agricultural technology and methodology which had been introduced from the late eighteenth century onward.[39]

---

[37] **Oekonomische Neuigkeiten und Verhandlungen. Zeitschrift für alle Zweige der Land- und Forstwirtschaft, des Forst- und Jagdwesens im österreichischen Kaiserthum und dem ganzen Deutschland** (XXIII, 1822), pp. 239-240. As cited in Blum, **Noble Landowners**, p. 196.

[38] See Ema Umek, "Usmerjenost publikacij Kranjske Kmetijske Druzbe v letih 1770 do 1779," **Kronika -- Casopis za slovensko krajevno zgodovino** (Vol. XV, No. 3, 1967), pp. 149-150.

[39] Good, **Economic Rise of the Habsburg Empire**, p. 72; and Sandgruber, **Österreichische Agrarstatistik**, p. 119.

Due to the gradual improvement in transportation, enlarged markets made efficient and profitable agriculture an appealing opportunity as well as a good incentive to introduce new crops and techniques.[40] Without more capital, however, many of these new practices could not be fully implemented; without improved productivity more capital could not be made available, nor could many new technologies be introduced.[41]

Peasants were dissatisfied with their labour duties, as well as resistant to the implementation of agricultural innovations. This was because changes suggested by their overlords traditionally involved heavier obligations on the peasantry. The lord depended on his peasants for work and/or money as well as obligations in kind. In order for the lord to maintain his way of life, the peasantry could not be completely freed without compensation; therefore resistance to reform was common.[42] As far as progressive landowners were concerned, however, the Robot was no longer a benefit to agriculture. It was a detriment to profitable landowning; therefore, its elimination was extremely important to a small but growing and very vocal number of noble landowners.[43]

---

[40] Koropec, "Polskavska zemljiska gospostva," **Casopis za zgodovino in narodopisje**, p. 70.

[41] For an overview of increased interest in profitable agricultural production during the Vormärz, see Blum, **Noble Landowners**, Chapter 3, pp. 91-132.

[42] For an example of the difficult transition from feudalism to capitalism in Styria, see Mavricij Zgonik, "Prehajanje konjisko-oplotniske gracinske posesti na kapitalisticno gospodarjenje zozuje in odpravlja servitutne pravice," **Casopis za zgodovino in narodopisje** (Year 46, Vol. 11, 1975), pp. 48-63.

[43] Franz August Brauner, **Von der Robot und deren Ablösung für den böhmischen und mährischen Landmann: in böhmischer und deutscher Sprache** (Prague, 1848), pp. 37-41.

According to the Czech historian Stanley Z. Pech, Brauner, who wrote the Robot pamphlet before parliament was opened, "was perhaps the best expert on [the agrarian] subject in the parliament." **Czech Revolution of 1848** (Chapel Hill, 1969), p. 173. Brauner's previous writings included an extensive examination of the agrarian situation in

Despite still having powers of compulsion over the peasants in the nineteenth century, Austrian nobles were not satisfied with the work being done on their estates. Peasant discontent can be traced to the post-Josephine era (beginning in the 1790s) when feudal burdens were reimposed and support from the newly-formed educated middle classes began.[44] Those nobles who wanted very little to do with their estates found it a burden to deal with the peasants, who became increasingly troublesome in the nineteenth century. Nobles who were interested in the new agricultural advances were frustrated by the inefficiency of the system that was in place. To add to their problems, in western and southern Austria a labour shortage existed.

In these regions, peasant holdings were often large and prosperous. Peasants were even able to hire their own help in some cases.[45] These farmers were interested in reform which helped educate other peasants, giving them confidence in their demands. Anton Crne, a small landholder Slovene delegate to the 1848-1849 parliament, was one of these farmers who pushed for change in the Vormärz. Attesting to this were his extremely vocal demands for reform at the constitutional assembly.[46] As his voting records at the parliament show, he supported the peasants in their quest for freedom without the burden of compensation. It is likely that he was typical of small landholders and peasant farmers; the large-

---

Bohemia, in **Böhmische Bauernzustände im Interesse der Landeskultur und des Nationalwohlstandes besprochen** (Vienna, 1847).

[44] See Ernst Wangermann, **From Joseph II to the Jacobin Trials** (London, 1959), pp. 68-70 and p. 114; and Link, **Emancipation of the Austrian Peasant**, pp. 152-155, where she summarizes a pamphlet written by one such bourgeois defender .

[45] Blum, **Noble Landowners**, p. 181.

[46] Crne's views will be discussed in Chapter Three.

scale operations were the ones that had the most to lose by freeing their peasants, especially without compensation.

By 1848 there was widespread commutation of Robot and other obligations to money rents for various reasons.[47] Primarily, as everywhere in the monarchy, the Robot had become the hated symbol of all peasant dissatisfactions with servility and land/labour arrangements. As well as despising the Robot itself, some peasants had money to get out of at least part of their obligations and they wanted more time to devote to their own work. Although the landowners often preferred to have money from their tenants instead of obligated labour,[48] so that they could hire more productive wage labourers, casual workers were difficult to secure. In the parts of the monarchy where labour shortages did not exist, money in lieu of labour was usually not an option for most peasants. Everywhere in the empire, the nobles had to rely on their uncooperative peasantry to get work done on their estates.

Somewhere between the dissatisfied landowners and the uncooperative peasants were the liberal bourgeoisie. Like the noble landowners, they represented a very small percentage of the entire population, but despite the oppressive regime in the Vormärz period they were becoming an increasingly influential part of society. Many liberals were of recent peasant heritage so they were often sympathetic to the issue of ending servility. As well, their educational training in the new ideas of equality, individualism, nationalism and human rights supported such sympathies. This flamed their interest in the eventual constitutional parliament of 1848-1849, where liberal-thinking bourgeoisie formed a large majority of delegates. General statistics regarding delegates to the revolutionary parliament have been broken down as follows: 60 per cent bourgeoisie; 25 per cent peasants; and of the remaining 15 per cent only a few were clergy and noblemen.[49] Before and during the parliament, the bourgeoisie acted as facilitators in the liberation of the peasantry.

---

[47] Blum gives examples of this in the Slovene lands in, **Noble Landowners**, p. 181.

[48] According to a Polish delegate to the parliament from Galicia, "money is much more valuable than the Robot." **Verhandlungen, Volume I**, p. 447.

Liberalism was embraced by most members of the educated middle classes and gentry, but the shades of liberalism varied greatly. Despite their seemingly radical bearings, bourgeois liberals also possessed ingrained traditional views.[50] Their training and social standing gave them glimpses of conservative life and opinion with which they could identify, and in many cases, were pressured to espouse in order to continue in their chosen professions and preferred lifestyles. The middle classes and the lesser nobility had much in common and were known to associate socially as well as politically.[51] While believing that the peasants should be completely freed, because of their beliefs in individual rights as well as overall economic advantages, the liberal bourgeoisie bowed to the nobles in 1848 by supporting their claims of indemnification against the peasants (who could ill afford it).[52]

---

[49] See R. John Rath, **Viennese Revolution of 1848**, p. 277.

[50] To get a better understanding of the various shades of Austrian liberalism in 1848 and for a general overview, see Eduard Winter, "Early Liberalism in the Habsburg Monarchy: Religious and National Thought, Particularly of the Austrian Slavs, 1792-1868," **East Central Europe** (Vol. 1, Pt. 1, 1974), pp. 1-11; see also, Rath, **Viennese Revolution of 1848**, p. 3.

[51] Jones, **The 1848 Revolutions**, p. 69.

[52] While the nobles did not have many representatives at the parliament, their interests were looked after by the delegates. Some delegates' futures lay in the hands of landowners or their friends and therefore the delegates may have felt obliged to take into account the landowners' wishes. As well, liberal delegates tried to follow their own ideals, which

In the Slovene-inhabited lands, Germans and Germanized Slavs dominated the urban centres and country manor houses. This began to change in the towns and cities by the beginning of the nineteenth century when a newly awakened Slovene bourgeois class came into being. However, in 1848, the Slovene national movement was still little more than a variety of individual theoretical proposals discussed by a very small group of people; not until after 1848 did the mass of the Slovene population begin to be awakened. Reminiscing about his childhood, the Slovene politician and nationalist Josip Vosnjak (1834-1911) commented that at "home we usually talked to one another in German, but we also knew Slovene. However, we counted ourselves neither as Germans nor Slovenes because no one cared for his nationality before 1848."[53]

The Slovene bourgeoisie were thrown into action in 1848, unprepared and unsure of their positions and their allies. Like their counterparts throughout Austria, Slovene intellectuals faced the revolutionary events with conflicting interests. Their loyalties were divided between their enlightenment beliefs, ethnic heritage, growing nationalism and their class, professions, ambitions and benefactors.[54]

---

included some form of compensation to the landowners due to their deep respect for property rights.

Many of the Slovene delegates were in favour of compensation to the lords, if the state were to pay for it. Some delegates were hesitant to loudly advocate the cancellation of personal obligations without compensation, however, because of their electorate's priorities. Josip Apih, **Slovenci in 1848** (Ljubljana, 1888), p. 184.

[53] Josip Vosnjak, **Spomini, Volume I** (Ljubljana, 1905-1906), pp. 11-12; as cited in Novak, "At the Roots of Slovene National Individuality," **Papers in Slovene Studies**, p. 99.

[54] See the introduction of this thesis (Chapter One), which deals with the Slovenes in the period before 1848.

These conflicts included the idea of whether or not the Slovenes could and should exist alone as a nation, or whether they should be developing closer relations with other Slavs.[55] Because the Germans were the overlords of the Slovene population, many Slovene intellectuals had mixed feelings about them -- Germans were their role models professionally and economically and yet it was Germans who were their closest rivals for positions, land and wealth. Increasingly by 1848, and more intensely in the second half of the nineteenth century, the development of Slovene nationalism became a sore spot with Germans in the area: their power as well as their own nationalism were exposed to the claims of an increasingly aware rival nationality.[56]

A compromising attitude was taken by some Slovene bourgeois in 1848, especially by the liberal delegates who attended the constitutional parliament. They understood better than many of their fellow Slovene intellectuals that they had to be moderate in their views in order to be acknowledged in, and able to participate at, higher levels of discussion.[57] Other members of the Slovene bourgeois, like Matija Majar, showed early interest in liberal, German-orchestrated activities which involved issues like the constitution and compensation. They quickly became disenchanted with the German establishment and rational compromises, however, and focused instead on the romantic-influenced ideas of a Slovene national program and their relationship to other Slavic nations.[58]

---

[55] Loncar, **The Slovenes: A Social History**, pp. 57-59.

[56] Berthold Sutter, "Die politische und rechtliche Stellung der Deutschen in Österreich, 1848 bis 1918," **Die Habsburgermonarchie 1848-1918, Band III: Die Völker des Reiches** (Part One, Vienna, 1980); specifically regarding Carniola, Carinthia and Styria, see pp. 248-255.

[57] Janko Pleterski, "Die Slowenen," **Die Habsburgermonarchie 1848-1918, Band III: Die Völker des Reiches** (Part Two, Vienna, 1980), pp. 803-804.

While the bourgeois liberals had divided interests before and during the revolution, landowners and peasants focused on agrarian concerns. Until 1848, most Austrian landowners wanted to keep the peasants tied to them in some way, although many progressive (liberal-influenced) landowners realized that agriculture needed to be reformed. Some landowners even agreed that the Robot was an ineffective labour tool and were willing to see its elimination. The peasants themselves not only wanted to be rid of the Robot, but they also wanted to be completely free of all remaining personal ties of servility. Most areas of Austria had already eliminated the hereditary components of servility by 1848. Nonetheless, the remaining obligations were bitterly resented.[59]

Key to the amount of discontent and desperation among peasants were the conditions in which they lived, and these circumstances varied dramatically throughout the monarchy. The districts of Lower Austria, Upper Austria, Styria, Carinthia and Carniola had heavier payments in kind and money, but lighter labour services and a less oppressive personal status. For example, in Carniola and Styria, children were under no obligation to enter into servitude with the parents' landlord. Also, marriages between peasants of different estates in Carniola were not subject to approval by the lord.[60] In the Bohemian and Galician lands the situation was the reverse, with much heavier labour obligations and personal ties, but fewer payments in kind and money.[61] Even among the most comfortable peasants (arguably in the western and southern parts of Austria), peasant grievances were many and varied. Treatment of Galician peasants was most severe, however, and their resistance to serfdom was a major factor in the final freeing of the Austrian peasantry.[62]

---

[58] See I. V. Churkina, "Politicheskaia programma Matii Maiara v 1848 godu," **Sovetskoe slavianovedenie** (No. 5, 1969), pp. 22-33.

[59] Blum, **Noble Landowners**, pp. 230-232.

[60] Sergij Vilfan, **Pravna zgodovina Slovencev** (Ljubljana, 1961), pp. 283-288 and pp. 383-386.

In 1846 a provincial insurrection of Poles was planned by democratic Polish gentry with the intent of the separation of Galicia from the monarchy. The plan backfired, with hundreds of Polish landowners slaughtered and a large amount of property burned in what has become known as the peasant revolt of 1846.[63] The peasants revolted against their landowners' plan mainly in protest against their servility, but also in part to defend the empire's position in Galicia. The Austrian monarchy was shaken by the extent of the uprising, but it was pleased that the peasantry had refused participation with the nobles.[64]

In response to the uprising, the crown issued decrees regarding peasant obligations, although they basically amounted to repetitions of existing laws. The government's efforts were meant to pacify the peasants and keep their loyalty, while holding them at bay. The peasants in Galicia were left unsatisfied, but they did not rise in further rebellion; their grievances were against their overlords, not against their emperor. Peasants elsewhere in the empire heard about the great uprising, and even though they were not as ambitious in their desire for change, they also began to clamour for attention.[65]

---

[61] Good, **Economic Rise of the Habsburg Empire**, pp. 72-73.

[62] For an excellent description of the Galician peasantry and their lives in general, with emphasis on the Ukrainians, but including the Poles, see Himka, "Serfdom and Servitudes," in **Galician Villagers**, pp. 1-58.

[63] See Thomas W. Simons, Jr., "The Peasant Revolt of 1846 in Galicia: Recent Polish Historiography," **Slavic Review** (Vol. 30, No. 4, 1971), pp. 795-817.

[64] ibid.: Simons finds the most plausible and well-researched argument for the causes of 1846, as above, to be from the historian Stefan Keniewicz (p. 815); Keniewicz believed that (in Simons' words) the "Austrian bureaucracy was responsible for the massacre in the sense that the peasants had been given the (correct) impression that they would not be prevented from murdering their lords and burning the manors." (p. 801) The government was not willing to agree to full agrarian reform, however, because it feared that action would bring about a coalition of the peasantry and the landowners (p. 801).

The entire Austrian peasantry was left discontented. This was demonstrated in many parts of the empire by their increased refusal to fulfill obligations to the lords. Nobles, fearing for their lives and property, were thus more willing to see full agrarian reform implemented in the future.[66] In many ways, it is fitting that this important agitation originated in Galicia, the area of Austria where serfdom was the most entrenched, whose landowners were the most cruel and the least receptive to reforms. The time for change was near.

---

[65] Rosdolsky, **Die Baurenabgeordneten**, p. 16.

[66] Blum, **End of the Old Order in Rural Europe**, pp. 364-365.

See the government decree of 13 January, 1848, in reference to 1846: Item #7, entitled, "Ueber die Fortschritte des Robot-und Zehent-Ablösunggeschäftes sind halbjärige Berichte der Hofkanzlei vorzulegen," in the **Sammlung der politischen Geseße [Gesetze] und Verordnungen für das Laibacher Gouvernement-Gebiet im Königreiche Illyrien**, Volume 30 - 1848 (Ljubljana, 1855).

Chapter Three: 1848 and the Peasant Issue at the Constitutional Parliament

In the spring of 1848, liberal agitators (including nationalists) attracted the attention of peasants everywhere in the monarchy. This did not happen because of the appeal of ideologies concerning equality or democracy, nor because of the peasants' desire to overthrow their oppressors. Peasants were concerned with issues that affected their daily lives, as the Galician revolt and subsequent peasant behaviour showed. In the decades leading up to 1848, severing the remaining ties of servility had been the one issue that peasants were focusing on. The lean agricultural years of the 1840s added to their general discontent.[1] Liberal organizers recognized that the time was right for the peasantry to demand changes from the government. They were also aware of the other possibilities a peasant uprising would create for them. For the Slovene intellectuals, this meant organization and demands for national rights within the establishment of a reformed, democratic system.[2]

---

[1] The potato disease was an important problem in the monarchy during the 1840s, because potatoes had become a substantial part of the peasant diet. As well, the harvesting of potatoes for the distillation of potato whiskey provided income. The Galician peasant was especially dependent on the potato for food and income. The failure of the potato crops must be seen as an important contributor to the overall frustration, discontent and subsequent peasant actions in the mid to late-1840s. See Blum, **Noble Landowners**, pp. 107-110.

In 1842, Galicia accounted for 36 per cent of the monarchy's production of potatoes. See **Tafeln zur Statistik der österreichischen Monarchie**, Table 37 (Vienna, 1842).

[2] Joseph Apih, "Die slovenische Bewegung im Frühjahr und Vorsummer 1848," **Österreichisches Jahrbuch** (Vol. 16, 1892), pp. 175-208.

In March of 1848, peasants in Carniola engaged in a short-lived uprising. In order to get attention for their demands of change in agriculture, peasants vandalized local nobles' property. In August, at the constitutional parliament, the Slovene delegate Mihael Ambroz came to the defence of these peasants, stating that they deserved a general pardon for their actions. Some delegates wanted criminal charges brought against the vandals, but Ambroz reminded the assembly that the peasants were merely protesting against their harsh servile status. Since the democratic assembly and its members had been in unanimous agreement that peasant servility should be ended, Ambroz believed it should not be difficult to leave the issue alone. It was simply an old problem of friction between the nobility and their peasants. These past indiscretions should be pardoned, especially since the peasant outbursts were isolated and brief and there had been no further incidences since the spring.[3]

In reaction to the spring uprisings, the government quickly issued decrees, as it had done with the Galician peasant revolt of 1846. It was hoping to secure peasant loyalty against the nobles, but once again the announcements were not to the complete satisfaction of the peasantry. The Robot was repealed, but indemnification to the lords was ordered. The peasants wanted the government to declare full abolition of their servile status as well as exemption from the costs of indemnification. An exception was made in Galicia with the state declaring it would cover the cost of some indemnification there, but this suggestion only caused more discontent elsewhere in the monarchy.[4] In response to the peasant disturbances in Slovene lands, the newspaper Novice strongly stated its support for the monarchy's position. Its chief concern was to discourage further agitation by emphasizing to "the reader that the new freedoms [they had received] were a generous gift from the Emperor rather than a right to which the people were entitled."[5]

---

[3] **Verhandlungen, Volume II**, p. 206.

[4] Blum, **Noble Landowners**, p. 233.

The spring decrees addressed more than just peasant concerns, however, by including a concession to liberal agitators of all classes. A constitutional parliament was to be formed, with indirect democratic elections of delegates from all over Cisleithania. Eligible voters were decided by a limited franchise, which included a large number of peasants. Among the items to be discussed at the parliament was the emancipation of the peasantry. The crown, represented by its core supporters from the central government, would be involved in the new institution, but the general population was given a chance to readdress government decisions, including the spring decrees.[6]

After the initial revolution began, Slovene national organizations were formed in the provinces, and in Vienna -- because of the number of Slovene students and professionals there. These organizations became the centres for bourgeois social and political agitation, including the central campaign centres of the constitutional parliament. It was from these focal points that opposition to the Frankfurt assembly was solidified, Slovene nationalist positions were formed and the meaning and usefulness of constitutional democracy were debated.[7] After the initial agricultural protests, the revolution quickly became more than just a way to free the peasantry from their personal ties to the landowners. Importantly, however, Slovene nationalists did not enjoy the support of their peasantry, as Stanley Pech has pointed out. According to Pech, the Slovenes were "the only Slavic group to pass through the revolutionary year without mass demonstrations or rallies in support of nationalist objectives."[8]

---

[5] Stanley Z. Pech, "The Press of the Habsburg Slavs in 1848: Contribution to a Political Profile," **Canadian Journal of History** (Vol. X, Issue 1, 1975), p. 45.

[6] Rath, **Viennese Revolution of 1848**, pp. 179-181.

[7] Rogel, **Slovenes and Yugoslavism**, pp. 14-15.

While many peasants were not satisfied with the government spring decrees, they may have been enough to take the edge off peasant anger.[9] Of the sixteen Slovene delegates elected in the various provinces they lived in, only six were identified as peasants. The peasant-delegate ratio for other Austrian nationalities was much higher.[10] One historian has argued that the government decrees caused the peasantry, for the most part, to lose interest in the parliamentary elections.[11] This was especially true in regions where the peasants were not unduly abused. The loss of interest, along with manipulations by the nobles and the government, produced a much different representation of delegates to the parliament than what might have been. In Styria, the election of three nobles and a gentleman government official in a region dominated by eligible peasant voters supports this thesis.[12]

---

[8] Pech, "The Nationalist Movements of the Austrian Slavs," **Histoire Sociale/Social History**, p. 348.

[9] Contemporary description of the March and April decrees can be found in Items #38, #52 and #65 -- which include provisions for the use of the Slovene language -- in the **Sammlung der politischen Geseße [Gesetze] und Verordnungen für das Laibacher Gouvernement-Gebiet**, Volume 30 - 1848, pp. 98-101, pp. 131-132 and pp. 166-169.

[10] Joseph Apih, "Die Slovenen und der constituierende Reichstag 1848/49," **Österreichisches Jahrbuch** (Vol. 18, 1894), pp. 20-21.

It is important to note that not all "peasant" delegates were farmers; some were village workers.

[11] Rosdolsky, **Die Bauernabgeordneten**, p. 49.

When considered along with the idea of "naive monarchism," or peasant loyalty to the crown, this argument is an interesting one.[13] The idea of peasant veneration of their "benefactor," the emperor, cannot be underestimated. Despite being disappointed with the emperor for his hollow decrees and promises, the peasantry seemed all too eager to forgive him. Once again, the peasants regarded their overlords, not the emperor, as being responsible for their miserable situation. The extent to which all Slovenes were committed to their emperor was displayed in "the respect and reverence that all the Slovenian textbooks expressed for the Habsburg dynasty."[14]

Regarding the elections of deputies, many peasants felt that the idea of a constitutional parliament was a betrayal of their emperor, and therefore some peasants who were eligible for the limited franchise avoided participating for that reason. Of course, many peasants did not understand or even care about the idea of electing deputies for a parliament. Peasants in Carniola did not understand the difference between the national parliament and the provincial diet. This prevented some eligible peasants from voting for delegates to the parliament.[15] In the end, even if the peasants would have had more interest in the elections, the results of the parliament probably would have been similar.

---

[12] ibid., p. 50.

[13] ibid., p. 70; see also John-Paul Himka, "Hope in the Tsar: Displaced Naive Monarchism among the Ukrainian Peasants of the Habsburg Empire," **Russian History** (Vol. 7, Pts. 1/2, 1980), pp. 125-126.

[14] Banac, **South Slav Nationalisms**, p. 252.

[15] Peter Burian, **Die Nationalitäten in 'Cisleithanien' und das Wahlrecht der März-Revolution, 1848-1849; zur Problematik der Parlamentarismus im alten Österreich** (Graz-Cologne, 1962), p. 141; and Apih, **Slovenci in 1848**, p. 158.

Despite probable election manipulations, few nobles were elected, but they were still able to secure delegates to look after their interests. Most non-peasant delegates who had championed the peasant cause (mainly the liberals) looked after peasant concerns only to a certain point. Their liberal foundation demanded that they support the rights of property and, indirectly, the wishes of the landowners. This typical outlook was reflected in the program of a parliamentary candidate from Styria: "no *Robot*, no *Zehent*, neither of chickens, eggs, nor of cheese. Otherwise, however, everything remains the same."[16]

Some exceptions, however, included liberal members of the Slovene delegation. In the spring of 1848, Dr. Alois Smrekar lobbied to have a greater amount of the population (i.e. the peasants) involved in the process to nominate parliamentary delegates.[17] The opinion that the elections were unfair in Graz was repeated by the Slovene delegate Miklosic at the parliament itself.[18] Smrekar was one of the liberal delegates who voted against compensation to the landowners at the parliament, while Miklosic followed the liberal line by voting yes.[19]

Despite what happened at the elections and the parliament in the middle of the year, the peasants did hold the balance of power in the spring of 1848. No one knew just how far the peasants could be pushed; it therefore seemed expedient to all that their concerns should at least be considered. As well, each group wanted peasant support for its own special issues. It is not surprising, then, that the first important issue of the constitutional parliament of 1848-1849 involved the peasant-lord grievances.[20]

---

[16] Apih, "Die Slovenen," **Österreichisches Jahrbuch**, p. 20.

[17] A. Smrekar, **Gruß und Kuß den freien Wiener Brüdern!** (Graz, 1848).

[18] **Verhandlungen, Volume I**, p. 460.

[19] **Verhandlungen, Volume II**, p. 164.

Shortly after the opening of the Austrian parliament, a motion concerning peasant servility was officially put forward (on 26 July) by a delegate from rural Silesia. The petition outlined provisions for the abolition of servility and was approved by the assembly without hesitation. According to a Polish delegate, who quoted an old saying, "'The naked are not afraid of robbery'. If you want it gentlemen, then the Robot is abolished."[21] The fact that Hans Kudlich had introduced the bill was a bit of a surprise, however, since many delegates had expected the issue to be formally introduced by the Czech peasant expert, Franz Brauner.

Pech argues that Brauner was the first person, since the March uprisings in Austria, to demand the abolition of peasant servility. Accordingly, Pech believes that he would have led the peasant discussions at parliament had he not been delayed by imprisonment for his involvement in uprisings in June. The forthcoming arrival of this peasant expert was even heralded at the parliament by Justice Minister Bach, who announced to the house on 9 August that Dr. Brauner had been pardoned and would soon be joining them.[22] Brauner arrived at the parliament after the debate had been initiated by Hans Kudlich. He fully participated in the debates after his arrival, however, and was the leading Czech spokesman on the agrarian issue.

---

[20] The very first issue of the parliament involved what language the proceedings should be conducted in; German won out over some arguments for the use of native Slavic languages along with German.

[21] **Verhandlungen, Volume I**, p. 445.

[22] ibid., p. 440.

Hans Kudlich was a young, liberal university graduate; he was also the son of a German peasant, a fitting background for the sponsor of the motion which ended the hereditary subjection of the peasantry.[23] In some ways he represented the typical bourgeois liberal. He was in touch with peasant concerns -- even acknowledging his peasant background at the parliament[24] -- but he was also impressed by, and under the influence of, the wealthier and more conservative elements of society. However, the peasant issue proved to bring out Kudlich's more radical side.[25]

With his motion, Kudlich asked that the assembly abolish hereditary subjection and all the related rights and duties. Kudlich's motion included a proposal for the assembly to approve of the immediate end to all remaining obligations. He added that the question regarding indemnification (whether there should be any, and if so who should pay) could be settled later. The motion was carried without delay.[26] Peasants

---

[23] Pech, **Czech Revolution of 1848**, p. 174. Brauner's main speech was given on 23 August. **Verhandlungen, Volume II**, pp. 4-8.

[24] **Verhandlungen, Volume I**, p. 427.

[25] Kudlich's three-volume autobiography, **Rückblicke und Erinnerungen** (Vienna: A. Hartleben's Verlag, 1873), contains valuable information regarding the revolution. The set was unavailable for direct consultation on this essay, but many sources that I have used quote and comment on his work.

[26] **Verhandlungen, Volume I**, pp. 159-160.

These debates are considered to be a reliable source, but it has been suggested, by a delegate who wrote about the parliament at a later date, that the stenographers of the early sessions missed some of what was said in debate. See J. A. von Helfert, **Aufzeichnungen und Erinnerungen aus jungen Jahren. Im Wiener konstituierenden Reichstag Juli bis Oktober 1848** (Vienna, 1904), p. 131.

The sessions of July and early August are dotted with speeches by nameless, Abgeordneter (delegates). This problem is probably related to the inexperience of the stenographers since the only nameless delegates in the remainder of the recorded debates are peasants, while during the first month, many nameless speeches are obviously from had become unmanageable and it was recognized that the only way to pacify them was to completely end the remaining obligations and ties that had originated in serfdom. There was no outward opposition to the motion because the representatives were well-prepared for the issue.[27] The peasant deputies were sent to the parliament to deal specifically with this problem; those espousing any shade of liberalism were eager to put their stamp on the monarchy; and the few attending noble landowners either wanted to make agriculture profitable or simply wanted to be rid of the continual annoyance caused by the peasant question. All of the representatives had little choice but to agree to the motion.

The motion was passed without debate, so it is difficult to estimate what sort of opposition existed to the issue of ending peasant servility. Josip Apih has noted that the Slovene delegates met in Ambroz's room to discuss Kudlich's proposal and not everyone was entirely in favour of it.[28] He does not expand on this comment so one cannot be entirely certain who had reservations about it or the reasons why some delegates hesitated in approving the motion. It is likely that many delegates from all parts of the empire were unsure of how to vote on this very important initial issue because of the various pressures exerted on them by their constituents. Obviously, they overcame their doubts because there was not enough vocalized opposition to the motion to warrant a debate. After Kudlich presented his bill, the president of the parliament tried to ask if there were

---

educated and more-worldly delegates. See **Verhandlungen, Volume I**, 10 July to 22 August.

[27] Pech, **Czech Revolution of 1848**, p. 174.

[28] See Apih, **Slovenci in 1848**, p. 182.

any questions or comments about it, but he was interrupted several times with the answer, "no debates!"[29]

A heated debate did, however, follow this rather calm motion. It dealt with the controversial issue of the legal definition of labour services and of indemnification. Noble landowners were finally willing to free the peasantry, but they argued adamantly for indemnification in return for agreeing to end hereditary servility and relinquish peasant land. It was inevitable that the assembly would eventually approve some sort of indemnity to the nobles. Liberals in general were sympathetic to landholding rights and at the assembly this sympathy tended to favour the nobles' property claims rather than the peasants'.[30] But since the parliament was attempting fair and democratic proceedings, the issue of whether or not the lords should receive indemnification was the first component of the debate. If they were to be indemnified, the assembly then had to decide what services the landowners were to be compensated for. Lastly, the value of indemnification had to be calculated, and, importantly, those who would bear the costs had to be identified.

Kudlich himself moved to the left of many of his fellow liberal bourgeois delegates by stressing the evils and the irony of their situation. According to him, the monarchy expressed an interest in embracing more democratic and humane principles, but the peasants still lived in a world which was ultimately not very different from serfdom.[31] Kudlich's radical position was solidified by his insistent arguments against indemnification of any kind.[32] This was not a common position, however, since the majority of the house was comprised of delegates representing the centre, the right and the government, who generally all believed that the nobles deserved fair compensation for their losses. In addition, many delegates thought that the peasants should not be completely freed of their obligations until indemnification had been settled.[33] This opinion caused an outcry from peasant supporters, including a Slovene innkeeper, Matija Zupanec.[34]

---

[29] **Verhandlungen, Volume I**, pp. 160-161.

[30] See Kavcic's description of opposing sides of the indemnification issue and the sanctity of property, **Verhandlungen, Volume II**, pp. 33-36.

[31] "Here in the assembly a significant anomaly prevails: it is ironic to think that a sovereign Austrian people grants itself a constitution, and in all provinces a condition predominates that is, in essence, not very different from the old serfdom. (Applause.)" **Verhandlungen, Volume I**, p. 159.

The peasant delegates, especially those of the radical right, like the Galician peasant delegates, were very vocal in their opposition to indemnification. The political divisions within the parliament were fluid rather than solid, depending on the issues being discussed. The radicals on the "left" were largely in favour of total upheaval of the monarchy; on the "right" were those of a conservative nature; and, the "centre" position was usually taken up by middle-class liberals. To complicate the situation, a major factor underlying all the issues was the idea of nationalism. This was already strong, especially among the Czech, Polish and German delegates. Other groups, like the Slovene liberal delegates, were nationally conscious, but were not yet as clear about their positions, nor did they form a unified delegation with a nationally-conscious peasantry behind them. The Slovenes represented the entire political spectrum, depending on the issue being discussed and individual preferences and beliefs of the delegates.[35]

---

[32] In the parliament, those on the extreme political left "alone denied all historic rights and privileges;" Rath, **Viennese Revolution of 1848**, p. 276. For a brief description of what "liberal," "radical," and "conservative" meant for the Habsburg Slavs in 1848, see Pech, "The Press of the Habsburg Slavs in 1848," **Canadian Journal of History**, pp. 38-39.

[33] **Verhandlungen, Volume II**, p. 42.

[34] **Verhandlungen, Volume I**, pp. 646-647.

The conservative core of the central government and the royal court stood for compensation (although not paid out of their coffers), because they respected the rights of property.[36] The government argued that its survival depended on the payment of compensation to landowners by the peasants. Those who were pledged to support the government were committed to voting for compensation. Since they had promised to support the government, liberals had to consider the government's position on this issue, especially because it was the first major issue of the parliament. Liberal devotion to democratic political institutions forced them to take into account the government's attitude, despite the fact that the government was behaving less and less like a democratic institution.[37]

This liberal respect for political bodies as well as landholding rights stems from the fact that most liberal delegates were rooted in the study of law. In fact, lawyers dominated the entire central European liberal movement in 1848. This was the case with the dominant Czech party of delegates, but also with the Germans and other Slavic delegations, like the Slovenes. Nine of the Slovene delegates had legal training of some kind, although many of them were not practicing lawyers.[38]

---

[35] See Apih, "Die Slovenen," **Österreichisches Jahrbuch**, pp. 21-22.

[36] See Minister Bach's speech, **Verhandlungen, Volume II**, p. 84.

[37] See Brauner's speech (23 August), ibid., pp. 4-8.

[38] The Slovene delegates Ambroz (Ambrosch), Doljak (Doliak), Gorjup (Goriup), Kavcic (Kautschitsch), Krajnc (Krainz), Miklosic (Miklositsch), Rak (Rack), Smrekar (Smreker) and Ulepic (Ullepitsch) all had training in law. See Apih, **Slovenci in 1848**, pp. 150-153; and entries for several of the above-mentioned delegates in **Slovenski Biografski Leksikon, Volumes I and II**.

Some formal training in law was an expected part of any respectable education; therefore, the constitutional parliament was supported and dominated by such educated men with deep reverence for the written law. The consequence of a predominantly law-respecting body of delegates was demonstrated not only by the language and structure of the proceedings, but by the difficulty that liberal delegates had in relating to their peasantries and, therefore, in understanding peasant demands regarding the indemnification issue. The language gap between the peasantries and their leaders highlighted the great differences between the two groups in 1848. While the Slovene intellectuals functioned in German and Latin and only had a limited command of Slovene, the opposite was true for the Slovene peasants.

Many peasant delegates were distressed with the decision that the language of the parliament was strictly German. Despite the large Slavic population, German was the most important language of the monarchy.[39] Bourgeois culture was based on the predominance of the German language, and liberalism was an offshoot of bourgeois culture, so the predominance of German was not remarkable.[40] However, the agreement to use German for the proceedings does not mean that Slavic liberals entirely failed to use their native tongue. In fact, after 1848, the use of Slavic languages in all areas of personal and public life was strongly advocated by the liberal middle classes.[41]

---

[39] Pieter M. Judson, "'Whether Race or Conviction Should Be the Standard': National Identity and Liberal Politics in Nineteenth-Century Austria," **Austrian History Yearbook** (Vol. XXII, 1991), p. 82.

[40] See Ernst Wangermann, **The Austrian Achievement 1700-1800** (London, 1973), pp. 116-117.

[41] Zwitter, "Slovenski politicni prerod XIX. stoletja v okviru evropske nacionalne problematike," **Zgodovinski Casopis** (Vol. XVIII, 1964), p. 152.

Even during the parliament, there were numerous pleas from the non-German nationalities to have greater language rights in their regions. The Slovene delegate, Ambroz, voiced such an opinion on 11 September, after the peasant issue had been approved.[42] He wanted the same national language recognition that the Czechs had recently been given in their home areas, and what the Germans had always enjoyed. Importantly, in his request, he recognized the Slovenes of all the various provinces as one entity.

Despite their opinion regarding provincial rights, most liberals, including Ambroz, expected those who participated in discussions at the national level to be competent in German. Ambroz was known for his promotion of Slovene at the local level,[43] but he was adamant about the use of German at the parliament. He even went so far as to suggest that those individuals who were not competent in German should consider returning home.[44]

Dr. Alois Smrekar, another Slovene delegate, agreed with Ambroz when he said, "I am myself a Slav, but I support this motion all the more because otherwise the parliament would become an impossibility."[45] He stressed that they had come together at the parliament to build a democratic nation, but the question over languages would only destroy their worthy efforts by inflaming conflicts between nationalities. The only feasible language was German, because it was the common language of the monarchy. He added that it had been a mistake of the government's to not make the functioning knowledge of the German language an election requirement. Smrekar believed that the delegates should not be punished for this mistake, however, and thought it was still possible to come together by agreeing to use the common language of German.[46]

---

[42] **Verhandlungen, Volume II**, p. 322.

[43] See the entry for Mihael Ambroz, in the **Slovenski Biografski Leksikon, Volume I**, p. 9.

[44] **Verhandlungen, Volume I**, p. 7.

[45] ibid., p. 10.

While the predominance of legally-trained delegates at the parliament created a problem for peasant delegates because of liberal support for using the German language, their presence ensured further disruption. Many peasant delegates could understand some German, and crudely vocalize in that language, but Latin was an entirely different story. The tone of many liberal delegates was cultured and arrogant, reflecting their world view quite clearly. In discussing the various issues they often threw in the odd Latin term, which was totally incomprehensible to unworldly peasant delegates.

One peasant delegate's annoyance at the use of Latin has been recorded in the parliamentary debates. Kudlich occasionally used Latin terms in his speeches and in this particular example, he used Latin in an address which began with the question, "Should subservience (nexus subditalæ) ...?"[47] A peasant delegate interrupted him to say that he did not understand the Latin phrase. But the peasant champion Kudlich was only interested in continuing his speech, which was in fact an address in defence of the oppressed masses. He curtly responded to the peasant by saying, "It is merely a legal term."[48] That answer did not quite satisfy the peasant who protested against the use of Latin at all, but his objections were drowned out by an uproar in the house. The president responded by calling for order and then proceeded to ask Kudlich to continue, ignoring, like everyone else, the frustrated comments of the uneducated peasant.[49]

---

[46] ibid., p. 10.

[47] **Verhandlungen, Volume II**, p. 125.

[48] ibid., p. 125.

This example of language barriers highlights the distance between the liberal and peasant delegates -- a barrier that was strengthened, rather than eliminated, during the discussions about compensation. Having developed a deep respect for the law and being strong believers in liberal philosophy, most liberal-lawyer delegates were inevitably supporters of compensation. Despite being opponents of serfdom, liberal delegates could not deny that what they were fighting against had some legitimacy in written law. Most liberals were moderates, continuously searching for renewal of society, but always in a "justifiable" and compromising way. While acknowledging the human aspect of the issue, liberals could not ignore the legal ties of servility. According to Brauner, the Robot was from its inception, and still in the 1840s, "a legal obligation, that is not legally binding to the person, but to the land."[50] Compensation was generally accepted as a fair exchange for the land that the peasants would be receiving. As well, the bulk of the right and centre of the parliament as a whole, and its deputies, "were only too prone to hurl the epithet 'communist' at those who regarded it as absurd that the peasant should be required to pay for his own emancipation."[51]

---

[49] ibid., p. 125.

[50] Brauner, **Von der Robot und deren Ablösung**, p. 22.

[51] Pech, **Czech Revolution of 1848**, p. 178.

Such accusations were responded to by Michal Popiel, a radical Polish democrat, who asked how giving peasants rights that had already been earned through the blood and sweat of generations of hard work could be compared to communism. He said it was like comparing a mosquito and an elephant and exclaiming that they were the very same thing.[52] The Slovene delegate Dr. Anton Gorjup was in general agreement with Popiel, because he believed that the peasants should not have to pay for the land they occupied. In response to the parliamentary remarks on communism, Gorjup noted that what many liberals proposed to do -- by having the peasants compensate the lords -- was closer to communism than anything he was proposing.[53] Being accused of espousing communism was not only an insult to any liberally-minded delegate, but considering how relatively new they were to the political scene, and recognizing their deep desire to become legitimized, it was an accusation that they would have liked to avoid at all costs.

General liberal philosophy in the laissez-faire tradition, as reflected in the writings of Brauner, also helped solidify liberal approval of compensation to the nobles.[54] In short, liberal belief in a freer economy could not include the feudal labour system. Most liberals agreed with the progressive noble landowners, to a certain extent, that the system was unproductive and needed to be changed. They also believed that individuals had rights of personal freedom. As a result, they could not endorse the system of personal ties to the land and its owners which was in place.

---

[52] **Verhandlungen, Volume I**, p. 546.

[53] ibid., p. 621.

[54] Brauner, **Von der Robot und deren Ablösung**, pp. 90-92.

Liberal thinkers such as Brauner, who believed in the sanctity of the law, felt that landowners should be compensated fairly for their loss of income from the land, but not for the loss of personal obligations given them. Since the liberal attitude of laissez-faire economics did not theoretically support the interferences of government subsidies in a free economy, they generally believed the peasants themselves should pay a fair price for their land. Brauner even included what he thought was a fair repayment proposal in his pamphlet on the Robot.[55] This was an attitude reflecting the wishes of the government and one that Brauner defended at the constitutional parliament.[56]

The agrarian question was taken up with great interest by the Slovene liberal delegates who agreed that peasants should be treated as free individuals. For them, this included elimination of the Zehent, which was a hated obligation in the Slovene lands. However, the issue of compensation was highly debated. For peasant delegates, the idea of payments to landowners for the loss of services and land was absurd. For liberal delegates, the issue was not nearly so clear; there were many factors which had to be seriously considered.[57]

In the liberal tradition of laissez-faire economics, the vocal Slovene delegate, Matija Kavcic, believed that some sort of compensation to the landowners was necessary in order to prevent an economic crisis in the monarchy. He agreed that the Zehent should be immediately eliminated, but he proposed that the eighth, or Octava, should stay for three years in order to help ease the transition.[58] Kavcic recognized that without compensation of some kind, it would be extremely difficult to avoid economic disaster.[59] This attitude was reflected by the majority of Slovene liberal delegates, including Doljak, who proposed very similar amendments.[60] But concern for peasants tempered the harshness of their support for compensation. With a more sensitive outlook than Brauner and many other liberals, the Slovene liberals tried to make the burden for peasants as manageable as possible.

---

[55] ibid., following p. 92.

[56] **Verhandlungen, Volume II**, pp. 4-8.

[57] Rosdolsky, **Die Bauernabgeordneten**, pp. 54-55.

While supporting compensation to the landowners, Slovene liberals took a stand in support of peasant rights to common pastures and woodlands. Since the peasants had been granted freedom from their obligations to the landowners, the lords demanded that their obligations to the peasants should also be eliminated. Peasants had traditional rights to use the forests and pastures for personal use (called servitudes), but the landowners were demanding that those areas should now be considered exclusively their private property.[61]

Dr. Ulepic and others recognized that while not compensating the landowners for at least some of their losses was wrong, and might lead to overall economic ruin, one also had an obligation to help the peasants. The complete loss of pasture, hunting and woodland privileges would definitely lead to peasant ruin.[62] The majority of delegates at the parliament agreed with delegate Streit, however, a man who opposed Ulepic's and others' views on the woodlands issue. Streit believed that the nobles should retain the rights of the manorial woodlands in spite of the repercussions it would have on the peasantry.[63] Doljak tried to be as fair as possible regarding the peasant issue, but he tended to favour the nobles. He agreed with people like Streit who thought the rights to woodlands were unequivocally with the nobles.[64]

---

[58] **Verhandlungen, Volume I**, pp. 442-443.

[59] **Verhandlungen, Volume II**, p. 33.

[60] **Verhandlungen, Volume I**, pp. 465-466.

[61] Himka, **Galician Villagers**, pp. 37-38.

The issue of forests and pastures was a difficult one and was very important because it was not resolved throughout the empire until the twentieth century. In the Slovene area of Konjice (Lower Styria), the fight for and against servitudes relating to the manorial forests and pastures continued into the 1890s.[65] Regulating and solving the rights of servitudes was not an easy matter. It is a subject that highlights well the tenacity of the peasants in steadfast, but not usually violent pursuit of their rights.

Valentin Stercin, a Slovene peasant representative from Carinthia, voiced an opinion supporting peasant rights on this issue at the parliament. He presented a petition which outlined his objection to any compensation to the nobles from the peasants for matters such as grazing rights.[66] Stercin not only suggested a complete reorganization of agriculture, however; he also called for the official use of the Slavic national languages. This was quite remarkable and very important coming from a peasant. His concerns show that although peasants were mainly interested in everyday issues, they were also starting to become aware of ethnic unity. According to Stercin, the main enemy of the peasant masses in his home province of Carinthia was the German nobility.[67]

---

[62] **Verhandlungen, Volume I**, p. 503-504.

[63] ibid., p. 508.

[64] ibid., p. 466.

[65] Zgonik, "Prehajanje konjisko-oplotniske grascinske posesti," **Casopis za zgodovino in narodopisje**, pp. 57-59.

[66] **Verhandlungen, Volume I**, p. 582 and **Volume IV**, Petition #360, following p. 60: "Petition um gänzliche Umstaltung der Unterthansverhältnisse, um Einführung der Landessprache in den Aemtern, wegen des Salzpreises und der Verzehrungssteuer."

On the compensation issue, the three dissenting liberal voices of the Slovene delegation belonged to Smrekar, representing Styria, Ambroz of Carniola and Gorjup of the Istrien Peninsula. Like some other liberals, they supported the idea that the peasants should not pay compensation for any loss of services. Those services were derived from the abuses of feudalism which involved personal ties to the land and landowner -- ties which many liberals considered to be infringements on personal equality and freedom. Taking this idea further, Ambroz believed that an approval of indemnification justified the previous servitudes, and therefore he could not endorse the bill.[68]

Most liberals went only as far as agreeing that the loss of some peasant obligations should not be included in the compensation package. Gorjup and Smrekar strayed quite seriously from this common liberal position, however, by denying that the lords had indisputable landholding rights. They retained the liberal belief in the sanctity of property, but they believed peasants should not have to pay compensation for the land because the lords were not the true owners of it; the resident peasants were.[69] A

---

[67] Rosdolsky, **Die Bauernabgeordneten**, p. 150.

[68] **Verhandlungen, Volume I**, pp. 220-221.

[69] ibid., pp. 620-625.

German delegate from the northern part of the Slovene territory had a similar opinion, but went far beyond the boundaries of liberal protocol by denying all bases of legal rights. He wondered how one could talk about such rights of property and obligations when the entire system was based on forced labour, akin to slavery. His words aptly illustrate his anger: "Oh these unmerciful landowners who have sucked the last drops of blood from the peasant!"[70]

Also discarding much of what he regarded as liberal rhetoric about the sanctity of property, et cetera, the Slovene deputy Anton Crne got right to the heart of the matter. He could not believe that the liberal deputies were actually considering payment of compensation to the nobles, despite the fact that they had treated peasants like slaves. In his opinion, the peasants should be compensated, not the lords.[71] As Crne's position on the peasant issue shows, the delegate had little sympathy for either the nobility or the government. He described the bureaucracy and absolutism as "two tyrants directed against the spirit and property of mankind."[72] Crne added that the aristocracy and the feudal system were a similar pair of tyrants who completed their already numerous list of crimes with the absolute suppression of the Slavs.[73]

Crne has been described as a Gutsbesizer by Apih, which can be translated as "lord" of the manor or landowner.[74] Crne was not a noble landowner, however, which is quite evident considering his vehement criticism of their compensation demands, their treatment of peasants and their class in general. According to him, the nobility unrightfully claimed as its property both land and justice, as well as servitudes and people. Before the final vote on the peasant issue was taken, Crne made another speech against compensation. Once again he expressed his disbelief about compensation to the landowners -- a proposal, if it were approved, that would force the peasants to pay with their own blood, blood "which now ought to flow no more from these wounds."[75]

---

[70] ibid., p. 474.

[71] ibid., p. 508.

[72] ibid., p. 510.

[73] ibid., p. 510.

[74] Apih, "Die Slovenen," **Österreichisches Jahrbuch**, p. 21.

As this vivid description shows, Crne and the peasant Slovene delegates were very clear about their positions regarding the peasant issue. Only a few Slovene liberal delegates took firm stands against any compensation, while the majority felt that peasants should not necessarily bear the full cost of indemnification. Kavcic was among the latter group of delegates. He supported the peasants' rights to woods and meadows, and he believed that, although some indemnification should be paid, the peasants should not bear the full burden of those costs.[76] He recognized that the peasants had very little with which to pay indemnification and so he proposed an alternate plan.

In a long speech that described the arguments for and against compensation, Kavcic tried to bring the different sides together. He accurately described the discussions by saying that, "Both parties dance on historical rights,"[77] arguing the legitimacy of each side's rights. In his opinion, the problems could not be resolved through intricate discussions on the nature of obligations and land entitlement. Kavcic's answer to the stalemate was a proposal that the lords should be partially compensated by the peasants, with the remainder coming out of government funds.[78] Dr. Löhner commented that such a proposal would be impossible to undertake.[79] This proposal was also not favoured by the government, which was very specific with its figures, showing that the peasants could indeed afford to pay compensation without its help.[80]

---

[75] **Verhandlungen, Volume II,** p. 57.

[76] ibid., p. 135-136.

[77] ibid., p. 34.

Despite the disbelieving responses about his compensation proposal from fellow liberals, like Löhner, Kavcic did not abandon liberal economic theory, but he was being quite creative with his liberal beliefs. Part of many liberals' core beliefs was the freedom of religion. While Kavcic did not think that any one church should have unlimited freedoms, he still believed the church had an important role to play in society. But he resented the independent power of the Roman Catholic Church, which had its head outside of the empire's boundaries, so he proposed a reduction of its power that would help resolve the indemnification issue.[81]

The church, he believed, should return all property that came from the state. That land would then be sold, with its profits placed in trust. When compensation to the landowners had been calculated, Kavcic proposed that the government could pay for part of it from these special funds. The remaining dues would then be paid for by the peasant.[82] The Kavcic proposal was a creative approach to compensation, which balanced liberal principles with reality, but was too radical for his fellow liberal delegates and the government they were all sworn to serve.

---

[78] ibid., p. 35.

[79] **Verhandlungen, Volume I**, p. 475.

[80] **Verhandlungen, Volume II**, pp. 84-91.

[81] ibid., pp. 35-36. See also the entry for Matija Kavcic in the **Slovenski Biografski Leksikon, Volume I**, p. 438.

Since many liberal delegates were unwilling to consider deviations of interpretion from liberal doctrine on economic issues (like the Kavcic proposal), it is not very difficult to understand why there were tensions in the liberal camp regarding nationalistic tendencies from within their ranks. In the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries, liberalism was identified with "Germanness."[83] By the mid-nineteenth century politically active Germans regarded any form of Slavic nationalism as a reactionary force, because liberally-oriented nationalists had begun to break ties with the German liberal order. At the constitutional parliament the Czechs were the dominant Slavic nationality and had the support of many other Slavs, including the Slovenes, on most issues.

By 1848 the Czechs already had a well-developed national character and some political strength. Of all the Habsburg Slavs, the Czechs were the most unified and had the greatest support of their peasantry.[84] While the German liberals saw their own ethnic identity as deriving from their political sympathies, the Czech bourgeoisie based their social identification first on their Slavic ethnicity, then on their learned German-liberal philosophy. Their self-identity was inherently at odds with the powerful centralized German-speaking bureaucracy and anyone else who stood in their way of achieving autonomy. The mixture of ethnicity and liberalism led to odd alliances and conflicts during the revolutionary year, including at the constitutional parliament.

---

[82] **Verhandlungen, Volume I**, p. 443.

[83] Judson, "'Whether Race or Conviction Should Be the Standard'," **Austrian History Yearbook**, p. 83.

[84] Pech, "The Nationalist Movements of the Austrian Slavs in 1848," **Histoire Sociale/Social History**, p. 353.

Because of their strong nationalism, Czechs clashed with Germans in general during the revolution of 1848-1849, but also specifically with German radicals during the parliament. Regarding the issue of compensation, this Czech-German conflict may have tipped the scales in favour of the nobles. Those of the radical left wing were mainly Germans (including radical liberals like Kudlich), who strongly lobbied against compensation to the nobles. The radical left position on the issue may have influenced the Czechs to vote for compensation. In the final vote regarding compensation to the nobles, 174 delegates, with Slavs predominating, agreed that compensation should be granted. Germans were a majority of the 144 delegates who voted against the proposal. Ludwig von Löhner, the German liberal who was vocally opposed to Kavcic's compensation proposal, was among those who voted against compensation.[85]

Considering that the majority of Habsburg Slavs were still peasants in 1848, the division of the vote is interesting. Why would the majority of Slav delegates vote against the wishes of the peasantries they were increasingly trying to identify and find favour with? One explanation is that the gap between the intellectuals and the peasants was still too great. Yet, the Czech liberal nationalists at the parliament, who arguably belonged to the only Habsburg Slavic nationality in 1848 to have any demonstrable support of their peasantry, voted for compensation to the nobles. The Slovene liberal delegates had a far less-developed sense of nationality and, therefore, a less developed relationship with their peasantry, but many of them supported peasant demands by voting against indemnification, or at least by abstaining from the vote.

---

[85] See **Verhandlungen, Volume II**, pp. 163-164.

Regarding polarization of other delegate groups, one should note that the Galician peasants' sworn enemies were the Polish nobles; those nobles along with Magyar nobles sided with the German radicals on many issues because of their national desires and aspirations.

Obviously, other factors involved in the issue were of greater importance than the claims of the peasantries. Along with the German-Czech antagonism, the crown's agenda may have been an important influence. Although the crown was itself a German establishment, it was also the head of a multinational empire. Its existence was imperative to the development of individual Slavic nationalities, like the Czechs, and the Slovenes, and the Czechs were already keenly aware of this in 1848. It is likely that the German-based stand against compensation at the parliament influenced the Czechs, but they also would have seriously considered the crown's position on the issue. Since the crown was their most important ally in establishing national rights and had clearly stated their position in favour of compensation, it seems logical that the Czechs would also favour compensation.

It is difficult to estimate what effect the Czech-German conflict may have had on the way the Slovene delegates voted. They often voted with the Czechs, but not always. As well, they were not as ardent in their dislike of the Germans as the Czechs were in 1848, because the Slovene national identity was not yet very well developed. Later in the century they would demonstrate similar feelings for the Germans as the Czechs did during the revolutionary year. But in 1848, and especially among the liberal parliamentary delegates, the Slovenes were still undecided about the

Germans. As well, since the Slovene deputies were not as nationally conscious as their fellow Czech delegates, they would not have felt as compelled to follow the crown's wishes. Although they were beginning to understand the importance of an Austro-Slavic empire to their budding nationalism, it was not yet compelling enough to elicit the kind of support from the Slovenes that it did from the Czechs.[86]

The decision to compensate landowners "moderately" was endorsed on 31 August. This happened after over a month of lengthy discussions on feudalism and the legal nature of labour services and related obligations. A total of seventy-three proposed amendments to Kudlich's initial motion were tabled. Kudlich, as the author of the original proposal, was disgusted at how long the debate took. Fourteen days into the debate he thought that enough amendments had been proposed, seemingly by every member of the house.[87] On 26 August he commented that, "We have examined the matter from all possible sides, from the social, political and judicial, from Tirolean and Bohemian standpoints, and what was the result?"[88] Kudlich also referred to the numerous amendments as a "Labyrinth," overshadowing the importance of the issue, and barring the way for speedy closure of the subject.[89] In reference to Kudlich's impatience, the Slovene,

---

[86] The importance of an Austro-Slavic empire is discussed in Chapter Four -- specifically regarding the threat of a merger with the other German states as an incentive for Slavic allegiance to the crown.

[87] **Verhandlungen, Volume I**, pp. 490-491.

[88] **Verhandlungen, Volume II**, p. 81.

[89] ibid., pp. 103-104.

Doljak, defended the right to table and discuss amendments. He was, of course, an author of one of the seventy-three amendments.[90]

The amended proposal that was finally approved at the end of August provided for: the end of hereditary subjection and the removal of all encumbrances upon peasant land, as well as the erasing of all distinction between dominical (demesne) land and rustical (peasant) land (Sections 1-3). All the dues and services of the peasant arising out of the abolished system were to be ended (Section 4): 1) no indemnification was to be awarded for the rights and incomes the lord had enjoyed that arose from the personal servile status of the peasant, such as the lord's right of jurisdiction (Section 5); 2) fair indemnification was to be paid for all dues in kind, labour or cash which were encumbrances upon the land and which were paid by the user of the land to the landlord (Section 6); and, 3) the rights of woods, pasture and fallow were to be ended without any compensation to the peasant.[91]

Of the Slovene representatives, nine delegates, including the less high-profile ones and some of the liberals, voted against compensation. Gorjup, Smrekar, Ambroz and Stercin as well as the other peasant delegates did not endorse the proposal. Five delegates, including Ulepic and Dominkus, voted for compensation. The famous Slavic jurist, Krajnc, was absent. Brauner, the great Czech peasant expert, abstained from voting on this issue. This demonstrated that his loyalties were obviously divided, as were those of the Slovene delegate, Kavcic, who also abstained.[92]

---

[90] ibid., p. 130.

[91] The Emperor's Patent was not officially decreed until 7 September. Item #188, **Sammlung der politischen Geseße [Gesetze] und Verordnungen für das Laibacher Gouvernement-Gebiet**, Volume 30 - 1848, pp. 468-471.

Kavcic's neutral vote reflected his different priorities, including some of the main points underlying the Czech position that has just been addressed. Kavcic's speeches and proposals in parliament proved that he was willing to support the peasantry, but he was also more aware of growing nationalism and the crown's wishes than some of his fellow Slovene delegates. Reflecting these priorities is the fact that he turned down an invitation to participate at the Frankfurt assembly because of his growing concern for the empire and the place for Slovene nationalism within it. He even went as far as outlining a new federal administrative proposal, with the emphasis on national sovereignty within the Austrian empire, during later discussions of the constitutional committee.[93]

At first glance, there were no obvious provincial divisions in the Slovene vote. Not surprisingly, all four Slovene "peasant" delegates who were attending at the time voted against compensation. Three of these delegates were from Carniola, a province whose rural population was largely Slovene, and one delegate from the German-Slav province of Styria. Only two of these delegates were actually peasants/farmers,[94] however, while one was an innkeeper and one a commercial shopkeeper.[95] Without possessing feelings of loyalty to liberal ideas, like their fellow bourgeois delegates, it was probably not difficult for the latter two delegates to vote according to their peasant electorate's wishes.

---

[92] Slovenes who voted **NO** to some compensation: Ambroz , Crne (Cerne), Dolzan (Dollschein), Gajar (Geier/Geyer), Gorjup, Grasic (Graschitsch), Smrekar, Stercin (Sterzin) and Zupanec (Supanz/Suppanz); **YES:** Doljak, Dominkus (Dominkusch), Miklosic, Rak and Ulepic; Kavcic abstained and Krajnc was absent. **Verhandlungen, Volume II**, pp. 163-164.

It is difficult to establish the ethnic identities of the peasant delegates who did not vocalize their self-identity. Apih claims Georg Gajar (Geier) as a Slovene; Rosdolsky has called him German. Apih, "Die Slovenen," **Österreichisches Jahrbuch**, p. 20; Rosdolsky, **Die Bauernabgeordneten**, p. 90.

Rosdolsky may not have been very well-informed about the Slovenes -- like so many historians; Apih may have been overly zealous in claiming fellow Slovenes. Nonetheless, this discrepancy highlights the typical uncertainty of nationalities during the 1848-1849 period. Especially among the peasants, national identity was not yet a priority.

There was also a Theodor Geier at the parliament, who is mentioned as one of the initial six parliamentary secretaries. He did not vote on the peasant issue which is helpful to avoid further confusion. See **Verhandlungen, Volume I**, p. 2.

[93] See Chapter Four.

Only one Slovene representative from Carniola voted for compensation, with the remaining four votes coming from Carinthia, Styria (2) and the Coastal province. With the exception of Kavcic, who abstained, only one Slovene delegate from Carniola did not vote against compensation. Along with the ideological influences, as outlined above, these numbers help explain part of Kavcic's neutrality on the vote. With a rural population so against compensation, it would have been difficult for a delegate from Carniola to vote otherwise. Despite being a firm believer in liberal philosophy, Kavcic was not in favour of having the peasants pay so much of the burden of compensation -- as his proposal regarding the church lands showed. However, for Kavcic and the one delegate from Carniola who voted for compensation, Ulepic, there was more at stake than the wishes of the peasantry. Both Kavcic and Ulepic would have felt the tug of opposing interests, but more so Kavcic than Ulepic, considering that Kavcic abstained while Ulepic approved the proposal.

While moderation and careful consideration of all the factors involved was an integral part of many liberal positions, most radicals wanted a complete upheaval of society -- hence their interest in the peasant issue. The peasants represented the bulk of the population; therefore they were, so the radicals assumed, sound allies in their fight for change. By helping to bring about the end of peasant obligations, hopefully without compensation to the corrupt landlords, the radicals looked forward to reciprocal support for the issues and actions they favoured. They were mistaken.

---

[94] The Slovene word kmet can be translated into English as either peasant or farmer.

[95] Many of the Slovene delegates' occupations are mentioned in Apih, **Slovenci in 1848**, pp. 150-151.

The peasant delegates voted, as expected, against compensation, but not unanimously.[96] Perhaps the delegates who voted for compensation did not fully understand the specifics of the vote. Other plausible explanations may be that they were influenced, either directly or indirectly, by the crown and its representatives, or by their landlords to vote for compensation. This argument does not hold true for the large Galician peasant delegation, however, who all voted against compensation. It is likely that in this case, those Galician peasants who were completely blinded by their support of the emperor did not even participate in the treacherous elections to a constitutional parliament, let alone stand as delegates. These peasant delegates who came to the parliament from Galicia were only interested in ending their oppressive life of obligated service. There was no other way to vote than against compensation. In their opinion, the lords did not deserve compensation, and the peasants could not afford to pay it.[97]

---

[96] **Verhandlungen, Volume II**, pp. 163-164. Although it is difficult to establish the identities of peasant delegates, it is possible to pinpoint at least one peasant delegate from Moravia (Heinrich Telcik) who voted for compensation.

Pech indicates that three other peasant deputies from Bohemia and Moravia abstained from voting on the compensation issue. See Pech, **Czech Revolution of 1848**, p. 179.

See Rosdolsky, **Die Bauernabgeordneten**, pp. 228-231, for a tentative list of peasant delegates to the parliament. The Suppanz of Cilli to whom he refers on p. 229, is the Slovene delegate M. Zupanec who has been referred to in this essay.

Once the issue of compensation was decided, the actual proclamation of the law created a problem. The radicals insisted that the parliament should proclaim the law as passed even before the sanction of the emperor was given. The tone of the rest of the parliament, as well as of the entire revolution, was decided by the outcome of this issue. Conservative forces, led by Minister Bach, won the approval of the majority of the house (183 to 119 votes), with the result that the law was officially proclaimed on the same day the emperor gave his official approval.[98] Support for radical demands quickly dwindled after this point.

Doljak, one of the Slovene delegates from Gorica (in the Littoral), publicly supported the crown's right to sanction laws together with the parliament.[99] This is intriguing, since he was such a strong advocate of greater democracy within the empire and autonomy of the provinces. He was also known for being very helpful to individuals and groups who had grievances against the monarchy.[100] One so against the centralized and autonomous monarchy seems an unlikely supporter for the sovereignty of the crown. Perhaps Doljak was able to separate, in his own mind, the role of the bureaucracy from the crown. The fact that he was from the coast is also significant. Slovenes from that area, and their nationalism, were extremely vulnerable without the monarch's support.

---

[97] See the speech of the Ukrainian peasant delegate, Ivan Kapushchak, where he vividly described how he believed the lords had already been compensated in excess by centuries of forced, humiliating work by, and treatment of, the peasants. **Verhandlungen, Volume I**, pp. 585-586.

[98] **Verhandlungen, Volume II**, p. 277.
The Emperor's Patent (dated 7 September) was published as a supplement to Item #188, in the **Sammlung der politischen Geseße [Gesetze] und Verordnungen für das Laibacher Gouvernement-Gebiet**, Volume 30 - 1848, pp. 468-471.

[99] **Verhandlungen, Volume II**, pp. 261-262.

[100] See entry for Josip Doljak in the **Slovenski Biografski Leksikon, Volume I**, p. 143.

Another Slovene liberal agreed with Doljak's support for the crown. During the parliamentary debates, Smrekar stated that if the crown did not have the right to participate, then the people also did not have a right to vote.[101] His liberal grounding, including his unwritten pledge to support the government, must be the reason for this. Although he rallied for increased provincial power, he was pro-Austrian and therefore pro-monarchy, like most of his fellow Slovenes. He emphasized the difference between a republic and a monarchy, and felt that since the people had shown that they wanted a constitutional monarchy, they had to accept that declarations of laws were made by it on behalf of the parliament.[102] The law was passed simultaneously by the crown and the parliament, much to the dismay of the more radical delegates.

Despite the disappointing conclusion to the peasant issue, a rally was given in honour of deputy Kudlich on 24 September for getting the emancipation bill through parliament.[103] The rally was attended by radical leaders, peasants, students and various supporters. It was orchestrated to encourage them in their fight for change, but change was a goal that was becoming ever more remote. Pivotal to any such success was the backing of the peasantry. Since they had supported the freeing of the peasantry, the radicals expected the peasantry to support other components of their revolutionary mandate. Peasant support for radical demands had, however, been dwindling since the spring decrees. There was very little, if any, left by September. Despite the cost of indemnification, the peasants were now free, and since their main grievance had finally been addressed, their support was once again fully with the emperor and his conservative forces.

---

[101] **Verhandlungen, Volume II**, p. 263.

[102] ibid., pp. 261-262.

[103] Rath, **Viennese Revolution of 1848**, p. 316.

Chapter Four: Budding Nationalism and the Kavcic Federal Proposal

By 1848 the Austrian governmental machine was at the point of breaking down. One historian has concluded that the collapse of the monarchy was imminent, not because of a lack of integrity or justice, but due to the administrative machine itself.[1] During the revolutionary years of 1848-1849, discussions about the reorganization of the empire focused on governmental reforms at the local and central levels. Diverse parties were involved in these discussions and were in agreement on at least one point -- that contemporary administration was not adequate and, therefore, needed to be changed.

The major underlying reason for dissatisfaction was a combination of growing nationalism and heightened ethnic awareness among the peoples of the empire. The Germans were the most satisfied with the system, because they enjoyed the greatest benefits of all the Austrian ethnic groups in the areas of politics, economics and cultural expression. However, Austro-Germans were fully involved with the sweeping revolutionary ideas of change in 1848, loudly voicing their opinions, along with the Austrian Slavs, on how that change should be accomplished.

The revolutions of 1848 were catalysts of immediate change all across Europe. In Frankfurt, the seat of the German diet, revolution was quickly transformed into legal proceedings of a constituent assembly by liberal German leaders. The deputies' agreed task was to turn the old confederation into a federally-organized nation-state. This nation-state was to be equipped with a liberal constitution that included civil rights for all Germans, a central government and parliament, as well as a unified, powerful military and ministry of foreign affairs.

---

[1] ibid, p. 8.

The initial central question in this pursuit of a great German state involved which territories should be invited to participate. It was eventually decided that delegates from within the boundaries of the German Confederation would be welcome to attend the parliament. This signaled a desire not only to embrace a more intimate relationship with their fellow Austrian Germans, but also to possess valuable outlying areas. Those regions included the coveted Slovene territories which could provide access to Trieste and the Adriatic Sea.[2] Importantly, that meant Austro-Germans as well as non-Germans were possible electors and candidates for the assembly in Frankfurt.[3]

During the early days of the spring revolution in Vienna, enthusiasm for a union with Germany was great. Germans throughout the empire considered the liberal reforms to be made by the Frankfurt assembly as even more important than liberal reforms in their own Austria. Students and other reform-minded Austrians even went as far as displaying the German flag and wearing its colours as a reminder of what they considered to be democratic German freedom in the face of Austrian absolutism.[4]

---

[2] Rogel, **Slovenes and Yugoslavism**, p. 14; Apih, **Slovenci in 1848**, pp. 75-76.

[3] Harm-Hinrich Brandt, "The Revolution of 1848 and the Problem of Central European Nationalities," **Nation-Building in Central Europe** (New York, 1987), pp. 114-117.

[4] William H. Stiles, **Austria in 1848-49, Volume I** (reprint of the 1852 edition; New York, 1971), pp. 118-120.

It is not surprising, then, that the idea of a united German assembly at Frankfurt was enthusiastically prepared for by the Austrians. Initially at least, liberal-thinking Austrians did not give a great deal of consideration to the kind of union that would work with Germany. Little thought was given to the idea that the Habsburg monarchy might not survive such a merger. Gradually, however, conservative members of Austrian political society voiced their reservations about a union with Germany. Opposing sides argued over whether a union with their northern neighbours should be in the form of a federation or a confederation and whether or not Austria would benefit at all from either relationship.[5]

Just as conservative Austro-Germans questioned the benefits of a "Greater Germany," Austrian Slavs quickly cooled their initial revolutionary enthusiasm upon consideration of this growing possibility. Fearing that German nationalistic opinion would not allow Austria to deal favourably with her Slavic peoples and their demands, the Czech historian Frantisek Palacky formally rejected participation in the assembly on behalf of the Austro-Slavs.[6] Palacky represented the Czechs first of all, but he also acted as a protector of the other Austro-Slavs in his support for a strong Austrian state which could rule with the cooperation of all its different nationalities.

Although the Slovene individuals who were politically active in 1848 generally agreed that a union with Germany would be detrimental to Slovene nationalism, opinion was not entirely unified. In towns and cities with large German populations, sympathy for a German union was widespread. As well, Slovene liberals were torn between the idea of German liberalism and a chance for a united Slovenia. Even the vocal Slovene delegate to the Vienna/Kremsier parliament, Matija Kavcic, was not opposed to a German union if Austria was permitted to retain her sovereignty.[7] Yet, Kavcic declined to attend the Frankfurt assembly when he was nominated as a delegate.[8]

---

[5] Rath, **Viennese Revolution of 1848**, pp. 137-140.

[6] Pech, **Czech Revolution of 1848**, pp. 80-85; for an English translation of Palacky's famous letter of rejection, see "Letter Sent by Frantisek Palacky to Frankfurt," **Slavonic and East European Review**, (Vol. XXVI, No. 67, 1948), pp. 303-8.

In a stronger protest, Matija Majar, a Slovene clergyman and intellectual who owned his own paper in Klagenfurt (Carinthia), wrote and distributed pamphlets against the Frankfurt assembly.[9] No Slovene delegates were sent to Frankfurt, although some of the cities and towns in Slovene-populated areas sent representatives.[10] Slovene reformers turned their attentions, instead, to the demands for a united Slovenia, the debate surrounding the Slav congress, and the constitutional parliament in Vienna. In the face of German enthusiasm, Slovene nationalists adopted the Carniolan provincial colours, and displayed them on flags and clothing as a symbol of unity.[11]

At the Frankfurt assembly, in October, 1848, proposed articles (numbers two and three) for a German constitution were finally adopted after lengthy debate. Article two specified that no part of the German empire could have a formal state union with non-German lands. Article three expanded on this idea by outlining the desired relationship for German and non-German lands with the same head of state. Any such relationship between these lands was to be through a personal union only.[12]

---

[7] Apih, **Slovenci in 1848**, p. 97.

[8] See entry for Matija Kavcic, **Slovenski Biografski Leksikon, Volume I**, p. 438.

[9] See entry for Matija Majar, **Slovenski Biografski Leksikon, Volume II**, p. 19.

[10] Apih, **Slovenci in 1848**, p. 74.

[11] Apih, "Die slovenische Bewegung," **Österreichisches Jahrbuch**, pp. 181-184.

For Austria, the adoption of these articles meant that the empire could not exist within a federal organization of German lands. To reduce the ties between Austria's German and non-German lands to a mere personal union would have been a political disaster. While the majority of German deputies voted to accept these articles, the attending Austrian delegation was split on the issue.[13] The idea of greater, formal and permanent ties to the rest of Germandom was a desired one among most Austro-Germans, but the reality of splitting the Austrian empire to forge such ties made the decision a very difficult one. Discussions about a union with Germany continued after this point, but the talks were much more informal and the plans encompassed less.

The survival of many of the Austrian Slavic groups, and their newly discovered sense of nationalism, depended on their continued connection with a powerful Austria outside of a German union.[14] The idea of a German union, despite the appeal of liberal ideology, was therefore not a popular one among the Slavs. Although some of the Slavs would be officially separated from a greater Germany, many Slavs, including a large portion of the Slovenes, would be incorporated into the proposed union.

---

[12] For the specific initial text, see the entry for 19 October, 1848, in the assembly's recorded debates, p. 2725: **Stenographischer Bericht über die Verhandlungen der deutschen constituirenden Nationalversammlung zu Frankfurt am Main**, Franz Jakob Wigard, editor (Frankfurt a.M., 1848), Volume 4; as well, the following days' discussions include interesting debates, proposed amendments and voting records; see at least up to 1 November, which ends on p. 3006 of Volume 4.

[13] Josef Redlich, **Das österreichische Staats-und Reichsproblem, Volume I** (Part 1, Leipzig, 1920), p. 143.

[14] An exception were the Poles.

By the mid-1800s, the German people were well on their way to developing their own nationalism and, therefore, they would not be able to favourably address Slavic nationalism. Even within the Habsburg monarchy, where a large portion of the population and the lands were Slavic, the Germans were extremely reluctant to grant concessions to Slavic nationalisms. Hence, the ability of the Slavs to cultivate their national aspirations was greatly dependent upon the cooperation of the monarchy. The chances of favourable cooperation were greater with a powerful Germany at arm's length from the Austrian lands, with the Austrian monarchy's full attention devoted to its traditional southern territories.

Slovenes were especially aware of their need to be attached to the monarchy in order to survive. This idea partly explains the Slovenes' generally cool reaction to the Slavic congress in Prague (June, 1848).[15] The congress was organized in reaction to revolutionary events, such as the pan-German Frankfurt assembly, with the purpose of having Slavs examine their mutual positions and options.[16] Although most of the participants were from within the empire, neighbouring Slavs also attended the congress, and, accordingly, the discussion included pan-Slavic unity.[17]

Despite some support for pan-Slavic ideals among Slovene intellectuals, the majority of vocal Slovenes in 1848 preferred the idea of

---

[15] Apih, **Slovenci in 1848**, p. 118 onward, but especially pp. 127-129.

[16] Frantisek Palacky, "Manifesto of the first Slavonic Congress to the Nations of Europe," **Slavonic and East European Review** (Vol. XXVI, No. 67, 1948), pp. 309-313.

[17] See Lawrence D. Orton, **The Prague Slav Congress of 1848** (Boulder, 1978) for a good, concise analysis of the congress.

Austro-Slavism. The survival of their newfound nationalism could be best preserved within a relationship of equality with the other groups of the monarchy. Attesting to their support of an Austro-Slavic solution above all else, the Slovenes did not officially designate any representatives to either Prague or Frankfurt. There were three independent delegates to the Prague congress who identified themselves as Slovene -- Stanko Vraz, Anton Globocnik and Alojsij Sparovac -- but there were no official representatives of a united "Slovenia." A cautious note of salutation was sent to Prague instead of delegates.[18]

In contrast to being submerged in a German union, the Slavs would be a majority in constitutional or federal Austria. This option provided a much better chance of preserving and enhancing their individual cultural identities. The idea of Austro-federalism was therefore a popular one among the different non-German ethnic groups of the empire in the decade before and during the revolution of 1848-1849. It was appealing because it was a method of reorganization that recognized, if not fully accepted, the ethnic factor as an important consideration. German liberals also put forward federal programs, but the privileged position of "Germandom" remained the most important consideration in these proposals.

Ludwig von Löhner, a Sudeten German and liberal deputy at the constitutional parliament, put forward one such federal plan for reorganization. In the spirit of liberalism, his plan included a grudging admission that, legally, Austrian Germans were no more than equal to other nationalities.[19] Löhner's proposal even included a territory designated Slovene Austria, which was to have Slovene as its administrative language. Significantly, the Slovene areas of Carniola, Styria, Carinthia and Gorica were included.[20] Not even the Slovene deputy Kavcic included the Slovene parts of Carinthia in his federal proposal.

---

[18] ibid., p. 47 and p. 63.

[19] Paula Geist-Lanyi, **Das Nationalitätenproblem auf dem Reichstag zu Kremsier 1848/49** (Munich, 1920), pp. 71-72.

Löhner's proposal was drafted in the summer of 1848 and was informally discussed at the constitutional parliament. At the parliament itself, however, the idea of ethnic federalism was formally proposed by the Slovene delegate, Matija Kavcic. Even during the discussions on the peasant issue, Kavcic talked about the idea of reorganization. He introduced his official federal proposal in January, 1849, but already in August, 1848, he demonstrated his commitment to reform by protesting the use of the word crownland. In addressing the issue of compensation, Kavcic informally suggested a reorganization of the old provinces along ethnic lines. According to Kavcic, by doing this the government would be better able to administer the changes in agriculture as well as address the inequity of having individual nationalities spread over different crownlands.[21]

During the peasant discussions at the parliament, Mihael Ambroz lent support to Kavcic's proposal, but not all Slovene delegates were as enthusiastic.[22] Despite supporting language rights for Slovenes, some Slovene delegates were still quite conservative in their opinions on reorganization of the monarchy. In general, the delegates from the coast, Carinthia and Styria were more supportive of replacing the crownlands than those from Carniola.[23] Slovenes from border areas required more support for language rights from fellow Slovenes than those of Carniola. In some ways, the remoteness of their location forced Slovenes on the territorial fringes to be more aware of their ethnic identity than their Carniolan brothers. As well, Slovenes in border areas would gain power by breaking apart the crownlands in order to create one Slovenia, while those in Carniola would lose some of theirs.

---

[20] For a discussion of Löhner's Proposal, see Kann, **The Multinational Empire, Volume II**, p. 13.

[21] **Verhandlungen, Volume II**, p. 135.

[22] ibid., p. 160.

Reflecting this position, one such Slovene, Peter Kosler, wrote a pamphlet in December, 1848, which argued for the unity of all Slovenes within a reformed and democratic monarchy.[24] He dealt specifically with the Slovene-Italian regions and stressed that each ethnic group deserved the right to use its language publicly. The best solution for this, according to Kosler, was the reorganization of the crownlands. Part of the reason Kosler called for discussions about the monarchy stemmed from his concern about the union of German lands. Such a union could have detrimentally affected Slavic nationalities, especially the Slovenes. Nonetheless, the example of a German union, however awesome, could also serve as a model for the linking of Slavic groups, like the Slovenes. Because the German union was such an important issue, even at the late date of December, 1848, Kosler believed there should be more public discussion about it. It was, according to him, "an issue in the interest of all Europe's political relationships."[25]

---

[23] Apih, "Die Slovenen," **Österreichisches Jahrbuch**, p. 25.

[24] Peter Kosler, **Das Programm der Linken des österreichischen Reichstages mit Rücksicht auf Slovenisch- und Italienisch-Oesterreich** (Vienna, 1849), pp. 1-20.

[25] ibid., p. 20.

During committee meetings at the constitutional parliament, Kavcic promoted the idea of redrawing the existing political boundaries of the monarchy to be more consistent with, but not exactly equal to, ethnic boundaries. His basic plan consisted of the following federal units: 1) Czech-Bohemia or Czechovia; 2) German-Bohemia or Boherheim; 3) Lower and Upper Austria and Salzburg; 4) German-Styria and Carinthia; 5) Slavic Styria, Carniola and the Slav Littoral as Slovenia;[26] 6) Silesia; 7) Moravia; 8) German Tirol and Vorarlberg; 9) Italian Tirol; 10) the Italian part of the Littoral; 11) Dalmatia; 12) Poland or Mazurian Galicia; 13) Ruthenian Galicia; and 14) Bukovina.[27]

Kavcic acknowledged conditional agreement with the Czech delegates Palacky and Adolf M. Pinkas, who had serious concerns about the idea of federation. Palacky was, at that point in the revolutionary years, decidedly cautious regarding a wholly federal system of organization. Another Czech delegate and committee member, Pinkas, argued that making provinces smaller would only make them more vulnerable to the larger neighbouring powers.[28] Kavcic added, however, that not to act, not to make changes, would be a mistake. He argued that every nationality had a right to recognition and a certain amount of autonomy, a statement that

---

[26] My translation of "Slawonien" from Anton Springer's **Protokolle des Verfassungs-Ausschusses im Österreichischen Reichstage 1848-1849** (Leipzig, 1885), p. 24 as "Slovenia" differs from Kann's English version, "Slavonia," in **The Multinational Empire, Volume II**, p. 27; according to the addendum error listed at the back of Springer, p. 386, bottom (Berichtigung) "Slavonien" should read "Slowenien" for pages 24 and 37.

[27] Springer, **Protokolle des Verfassungs-Ausschusses**, pp. 23-24; this proposal was recorded on 23 January 1849, during the constitutional committee's debates.

Springer's **Protokolle** is a compilation of notes, not official, formally approved minutes. Lewis Namier, **1848: The Revolution of the Intellectuals** (Oxford, 1962), footnote 3, p. 22.

[28] Springer, **Protokolle des Verfassungs-Ausschusses**, p. 23.

Czech nationalists could hardly deny. According to Kavcic, these problems could largely be eliminated by rearranging the political boundaries into a type of ethnic federalism.

Kavcic recognized, however, that provincial boundaries could not be wholly exclusive to one ethnic group. As a liberal-thinking Slavic intellectual, he believed that strengthened ethnic nationalism was a good thing and that the strength of ethnic nationalism would be greatest if it were reinforced by the formation of provinces based on ethnicity. The ethnic minority groups left out of their proposed home provinces would be protected because individual rights for all nationalities would be established on the basis of these national ethnic provinces. For Kavcic, however, the majority of ethnic groups had a right to be homogeneous and somewhat autonomous because, just as an unnatural marriage bears bad fruit, an unnatural land union ("unnatürliche Landesverbindung") was a curse on humanity.[29]

In dealing with this "unnatural land union," Kavcic organized his federal proposal from a Slovene perspective. The designated Slovene territory was ethnically unified, while other proposed units had several different ethnic groups within their borders.[30] Kavcic's divisions of ethnic groups seem fairly consistent, however, and correspond to his reasoning that ethnic exclusivity was not possible. Even Slovene territories were left out of Kavcic's "Slovenia" -- those being the Slovene-inhabited areas of Carinthia and Hungary. In his proposal, each different ethnic group had at least one main political grouping which would, in turn, help establish the national rights of the excluded individual ethnic communities.

---

[29] ibid.; from the Kavcic speech, p. 23.

[30] Kann has pointed out, for example, that Bukovina consisted of Ruthenians and Rumanians, that Silesia contained Czechs, Germans and Poles, etc.; **The Multinational Empire, Volume II**, p. 27.

The proposal that Kavcic presented to the constitutional committee was rejected by the other delegates; nonetheless his contribution was important. Kavcic recognized that the old system of crownlands was no longer a satisfactory way to deal with growing national demand and his proposal, although overly simple and flawed, suggested options worth considering. He was the first delegate to officially put forward an idea of ethnic federalism, a concept that was on the minds of many of his contemporaries, but which had not yet been seriously considered or debated.[31] The fact that this option, a rejection of the traditional historic ties to the land, came from a Slovene is also significant, since the Slovenes themselves did not have a solid national history to build on. Slovene nationalism was almost wholly based on cultural similarities, and historic political boundaries were major impeding factors, rather than strong negotiating tools.[32]

During the summer of 1848, the Bohemian Germans called for a dissolution of the existing provinces and for their replacement with circuits (Kreise). These new administrative units would be established on a national basis and modeled after the French départements. Slovene nationalists thought it was a good idea, but their enthusiasm caused unrest among the Carinthian and Styrian Germans. A motion of protest was made in the Carinthian Diet, and was even supported by conservative Slovene delegates. The motion was accepted unanimously and followed up by the diet proclaiming Carinthia a constitutionally "indivisible duchy." The major reason for the protest was conservative territorialism, but there was also a hint of German nationalism present.[33]

---

[31] After the Kavcic proposal, the committee finally debated concrete plans for reorganization, rather than continuing with disjointed discussions about the individual provinces. See Springer, **Protokolle des Verfassungs-Ausschusses,** starting at p. 23 until the end of the debates.

[32] See Burian, **Die Nationalitäten in 'Cisleithanien'**, pp. 9-13.

This debate is reflected in a Wiener Zeitung commentary of 18 January, 1849 -- right in the midst of empire-wide discussions about reorganization. The Vienna newspaper article discussed a debate about provincial reorganization in Carinthia, between the Klagenfurter Zeitung and the Grazer Zeitung.[34] The writer of the Graz newspaper article spoke out against any provincial separation in order to accommodate national aspirations. According to the Wiener Zeitung article, this argument was based on the fact that Carinthia was too small to be divided. The article in the Klagenfurt newspaper stated that it was a ridiculous concept, a point of view that the Wiener Zeitung at least theoretically agreed with. The Vienna newspaper responded to the provincial debate by asking the question, "how large must a land be in order for it to qualify for representation?"[35]

Reminding his fellow delegates that they were at the national parliament to discuss the future of all of Austria, not just the individual provinces, Kavcic went on to list his proposals. Carinthia and Carniola remained separate, then, for the good of Austria. Earlier in 1848, Kavcic had organized a petition to have all Slovenes together in one administrative unit, but at the parliament he gave in to the great German opposition he came up against.[36] German interests in southern Carinthia were greater than in other Slovene border areas so it seems logical that this area would be conceded by Kavcic to historical interests, while borders with the Italians, for instance, theoretically remained intact. His emphasis on rights for isolated ethnic groups outside their home provinces must be seen as points drawn up with the Slovenes of Carinthia and Hungary in mind.

---

[33] Thomas M. Barker, **The Slovene Minority in Carinthia** (Boulder, 1984), p. 60.

[34] **Wiener Zeitung -- Abend-Beilage**, (18 January, 1849), p. 62.

[35] ibid., p. 62.

Kavcic tried to address the demands of his more nationally-minded fellow Slovenes, who were ignored by the crown. According to Kann, "the government did not even pay lip service to Slovene demands, as it did in 1848 to those of the Czechs and in 1849 to those of the Croats and Serbs."[37] First of all, few people took Slovene nationalism seriously in 1848. Secondly, and most importantly, the Slovene demands were at odds with German interests. The Slovene population was intermixed with Germans, which was a major problem that would intensify as the century progressed.[38] Even in Carniola where the bulk of the population was Slovene, large pockets of Germans could still be found in the urban centres in 1848. As well, Slovenes were spread over a large number of crownlands, which made any concessions to ethnic unity difficult. It was a larger problem than some other Slavic demands for ethnic unity because a united Slovenia would greatly upset the delicate provincial balance in the empire.

---

[36] See entry for Matija Kavcic, **Slovenski Biografski Leksikon, Volume I**, p. 438.

[37] Kann, **The Multinational Empire, Volume I**, p. 300.

[38] See Sutter, "Der Fall 'Cilli' und das nationale Erwachen der Deutschen in den Alpenländern," **Die Habsburgermonarchie, Band III**, pp. 222-231.

Also: "The exigencies of the Slovenes, more than those of any other major South Slavic group, required some sort of Yugoslavia." One of the major factors for this was German nationalism. Ivo Banac, **The National Question in Yugoslavia: Origins, History, Politics** (Ithaca/London, 1984), p. 342.

Considering all the obstacles in his way, the proposal Kavcic made was a good attempt at meeting Slovene political demands that had been voiced by Slovene intellectuals in the spring of 1848.[39] In March, 1848, forty-four Slovene intellectuals, led by Dr. Fran Miklosic, presented a list of demands for Slovene cultural and political rights to the Carniolan estates. Little action was taken by the estates, but they did authorize a delegation to go to Vienna to see Archduke Johann, who was known to be a liberal and a friend of the Slovenes. The visit to the archduke was futile, but the Slovenes were not overly discouraged. Other proposals were formulated and discussed, including a Slovene program which was formally proposed in April, 1848 by the regional Graz "Slovenija" Society.[40] It was probably based on a petition by Matija Majar, the Slovene awakener who lobbied against sending delegates to Frankfurt.[41]

The Graz petition had widespread, but critical support among Slovene intellectuals. Its program included the formation of a united kingdom of Slovenia, containing the Slovene lands of Carniola, Styria, the Littoral and Carinthia, and the right to have its own assembly. In this assembly, the Slovene language would have the same rights as the German language did in the German lands. As well, the Slovenes wanted control over the introduction of Slovene in schools and public offices. The Slovene leaders voiced opposition to Slovene participation in the Frankfurt assembly, and proclaimed that only Austrian or Slovene laws should be binding in the territories occupied by Slovenes. Later revisions to this program included adding the Slovene lands of Venetia and Hungary to its territory, as well as demanding a university in their newly proclaimed capital of Ljubljana.[42]

---

[39] See Apih, "Die slovenische Bewegung," **Österreichisches Jahrbuch**, pp. 175-181.

[40] Barker, **Slovene Minority in Carinthia**, p. 60.

[41] Vasilij Melik, "Majarjeva peticija za zedinjeno Slovenijo 1848," **Casopis za zgodovino in narodopisje** (Maribor, 1979), pp. 286-294.

The Kavcic proposal took these demands into account, but because of the negative reactions to nationalist demands since April, his reorganization plan contained elements of compromise regarding the traditional historic units. These compromises disappointed ardent Slovene nationalists, but the plan was too radical to be accepted by many of the committee members. The Slovene committee members did not, however, believe that it was too radical. Although the Slovene delegates to the parliament are generally seen as being moderate in their nationalism and often sympathetic to conservative opinion, there were exceptions.

One example of this is the Slovene delegate, Jozef Krajnc, who did not agree with Kavcic's compromising proposals. He vocally argued against the exclusion of Slovene territories from Kavcic's "Slovenia."[43] After the discussion about Kavcic's proposal had been eclipsed by other suggestions for reorganization, Krajnc, Gorjup and Miklosic all voted for Palacky's proposal, which included most of the Slovene territories in his "Slovenia."[44] Despite voting for this united Slovenia, Gorjup, like other liberal Slavs, was not fully supportive of a complete Austrian reorganization. Part of this cautiousness stemmed from his concerns about centralizing the justice system. While he wanted a more unified Slovene territory, he did not want to sacrifice local power to achieve it.[45] Without substantial local power, Slovene cultural and political achievements could not be made.

---

[42] Alfred Fischel, **Materialen zur Sprachenfrage in Österreich** (Brünn, 1902), No. 102, pp. 331-332.

[43] Springer, **Protokolle des Verfassungs-Ausschusses**, pp. 37-38; Krajnc was a famous Slavic jurist who had difficulty securing prominent and deserved positions after 1848 due to his vocal reactionary position during the revolution; see also entry for Jozef Krajnc, **Slovenski Biografski Leksikon, Volume I**, pp. 547-550.

[44] Springer, **Protokolle des Verfassungs-Ausschusses**, p. 70.

Arguments against compromising proposals, like Krajnc's and Gorjup's, were futile, though, since the number of members on the constitutional committee who were committed to traditional, centralistic division and administration far outnumbered enthusiastic nationalist or federalist supporters. Despite the compromising formulation of Kavcic's proposal, he could not raise support for it from either his conationals or any conservative factions in the committee. It did not go far enough towards ethnic unity for the nationalists and it was too segmented for the conservatives. It is surprising, then, that other more prominent delegates continued to promote the federalistic solutions. Why would the respected Czech statesman, Palacky, for instance, put forward such an unpopular and relatively radical proposal of his own? This is especially interesting when one considers that Palacky himself was not completely sure about his own proposal.[46] Palacky did indeed have much more influence with his fellow Austrians than Kavcic, but he also had more to lose, personally and perhaps politically, than the vocal, but relatively minor Slovene delegate.

Palacky's proposals for a newly divided and administrative Austria began with a first draft that was conceived before the opening of the constitutional parliament. It had a strong emphasis on balance among the equally important factors of national, geographic and historic considerations, and was probably influenced by the German Bohemian demands for independent Kreise. During the life of the constitutional parliament, Palacky modified his ideas of division from strongly centralistic leanings to federalistic ones. However, Palacky's complete conversion to ethnic federalism did not come until December, 1849, after Austria's short-lived democratic experiment had been completely replaced with absolutism.[47]

---

[45] Springer, **Protokolle des Verfassungs-Ausschusses**, p. 70; and entry for Matija Kavcic, **Slovenski Biografski Leksikon, Volume I**, p. 233.

[46] Pech, **Czech Revolution of 1848**, pp. 215-216; this is a useful source, but one should note that Pech writes as if Palacky was the first and only true advocate of ethnic federalism on the constitutional committee; Kavcic is not even mentioned.

The great antagonism between the Czechs and the German radicals at the parliament was probably one of the major reasons for Palacky's rather late, and then half-hearted, support of a federally reorganized monarchy. German Bohemians favoured having their own province, while German radicals supported the peasant cause against compensation and called for a complete upheaval of the monarchy. The Czech aversion to cooperation with Germans in general cannot be underestimated. This is an even more powerful suggestion when it is considered in combination with Palacky's dedication to moderate change. As well, the fact that the German delegate, Löhner, was an early supporter of federalism must have added to his resistance to this idea.

Palacky's January proposal for federal division at the constitutional parliament included the establishment of the following national units: 1) German Austria, including the Alpine Lands and the German parts of Bohemia, but excluding the non-German parts of Styria, Carinthia and the Tirol; 2) Czech Austria, comprising the Slavic areas of Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia, as well as Hungarian Slovakia; 3) Poland, containing Galicia,

---

[47] Kann, **The Multinational Empire, Volume II**, p. 30.

Bukovina and the Ruthenian parts of Hungary; 4) Illyria, meaning the Slovene parts of Styria, Carinthia, Carniola and the Littoral; 5) the Italian group, including Italian southern Tirol, Lombardy and Venetia; 6) the Southern Slavs, consisting of Croatia, Dalmatia and the Serbian Vojvodina; 7) the Magyar group, comprising the Magyar parts of Hungary and Transylvania and; 8) the Rumanians of both Austria and Hungary.[48]

Palacky's proposal in the brief outline above appears to be quite similar to the ethnic federalism proposed by Kavcic, but the entire plan was more detailed than the Slovene delegate's proposal regarding the role of local government, governing Kreise and interaction with the central administration. Despite his greater attention to detail, Palacky was less realistic than Kavcic in certain areas, like the proposal of a Slovene territory that would include southern Carinthia. This point, among others, would never get approval from the German delegates. In this way, Kavcic was far more realistic in his proposed federal scheme than Palacky. In the end, Palacky's attempt to mollify both centralistic, German forces and the various Slavic groups also ended in the virtual dismissal of his proposal. The committee members who fully supported his version of reorganization (including the Slovenes) were few in number. Palacky resigned from the committee because of its rejection.[49]

Traces of federalism did find their way into the committee's final draft however. Credit for this must go to the persistent promotion of ethnic federalism by delegates like Kavcic and Palacky. In the end, however, the accepted constitutional draft was a modified, but definitely centralistic model. It was inevitable that, on an Austrian constitutional committee which was dominated by German centralists, the draft that was finally accepted was drawn up by a German, Cajetan Mayer, along traditional centralistic lines. Some acknowledgment of national demands was made, by the inclusion of ethnic Kreise, ideas of national self-determination at the local level and minor modifications to the historic crownland organizations, but the preservation of the centralized empire was the main underlying theme of the accepted proposal.[50] Not even this limited gesture to the nationalities was to become a reality, however, since the constitutional parliament was dismissed within weeks of approval of the draft, and a return to absolutist rule was quickly initiated.

---

[48] Springer, **Protokolle des Verfassungs-Ausschusses**, pp. 26-27.

[49] ibid., p. 121.

---

[50] The final accepted draft, based on Mayer's proposal can be found in Springer, **Protokolle des Verfassungs-Ausschusses**, pp. 365-383.

Chapter Five: Conclusion

On 4 March 1849, the Austrian government dissolved the Vienna/Kremsier parliament by military force and announced provisions for indemnification. The actions of that day effectively eliminated nationalist political activities until the 1860s. As well, although the peasants enjoyed new freedoms, the agrarian settlement left them at a disadvantage. By the 1870s, many Slovene peasants had been forced off the land. The years between 1849 and 1880 were not a complete set-back for the Slovene people, however, because it was the period in which their mass awakening occurred. The events of 1848-1849 did not awaken the Slovene peasantry, but they did begin to politicize them and expose the peasants to ideas about liberalism and nationalism. Once they were free individuals, their full awakening took a relatively short period of time because of the groundwork that was laid before and during the revolutionary years.

Once the Slovene language had been established, the building of a Slovene nationality could begin. Intellectuals began the process before 1848, but without the awakening of the peasantry, a nationality could not exist. Until the peasantry were freed from their remaining feudal obligations, however, their active interest in national development and rights was not possible. The importance of a free peasantry to the later growth of Slovene nationalism is reflected in the rapid collapse of peasant support for liberal and radical demands in 1848 once their main grievances had been addressed. It took a more moderate and gradual approach to nationalism, developed in the years after their freedom was established, for the Slovene peasants to agree to any further cooperation with the intellectuals.

Despite the seeming lack of gratitude on the part of the peasants, their cause was championed by liberal-influenced intellectuals during the revolutionary years. The definition of "liberal" was an encompassing one in 1848-1849, as the debates about indemnification reflected. The Slovene liberal delegates to the parliament were far more sensitive to the peasant position than many other liberals, but they, too, had divided loyalties. Part of that divided loyalty included, but was not dominated by, a growing understanding of Slovene nationalism. Even among more conservative liberal delegates, a sense of Slovene nationalism was present. Kavcic displayed moderate awareness of nationality in his federal proposal, while a stronger (but less realistic) sense of nationalism was exhibited by some of the other Slovene delegates, including those who criticized the Kavcic proposal for being too compromising.

Compromise was an important characteristic of the positions of liberal delegates. The degree of balanced consideration of the issues varied from one individual to another, and especially depended on the topics that were being discussed, but all of the liberal Slovene delegates were relatively moderate in their views. While many of the radical and conservative Slovene nationalists chose not to become personally involved in the new constitutionalism of 1848-1849, those who did attend the parliament reflected a more central approach to the issues. Although the ardent nationalists (who did not attend the parliament) have received more attention from historians than the parliamentary delegates, it is the delegates who are the best examples of Slovene nationalism in 1848-1849. Somewhere between the largely unawakened masses and the radical nationalists lay the compromising, liberal delegates who helped bridge the gap between the two groups in the decades following the revolution.

The delegates were loyal to their provinces and yet they were surprisingly well aware of their Slovene identity. They supported peasant reform, but were also devoted to the fundamental principles of liberalism and were influenced by conservative elements of society. Their involvement in the revolutionary years, and especially at the parliament, was key to the freeing of the peasantry. Although they were not usually of one voice in the house or on committees, they were all concerned about the peasants. Those who chose not to be involved in the parliament, focusing instead on a strictly national agenda, quickly lost sight of the peasantry while the delegates did not. The endurance of the 1848-1849 peasant resolutions into the neo-absolutist period attests to the important role the delegates played. They ensured that the freedom of the peasantry, which had been decreed by the emperor in the spring of 1848, was secured. They also lobbied hard to have the burdens of indemnification as fair for the peasants as they thought was possible.

The idea that complete freedom would immediately improve peasant lives was, however, only an illusion.[1] Peasant obligations were reduced following the revolution, but increased taxes -- to be paid by money -- were introduced to cover administrative functions the state had assumed. The state agreed to pay for a portion of compensation to the landowners, but the costs of this indemnification, added to the new tax burdens, exceeded the amount that most peasants could afford to pay. Small farmers were especially incapable of producing enough market surplus to meet the increased monetary obligations. By the 1860s, it became common to see liquidations of small holdings through voluntary sales or foreclosures.

---

[1] Werner Ogris, "Die Rechtsentwicklung in Cisleithanien," **Die Habsburgermonarchie, Band II** (Vienna, 1975), p. 616.

Between the years 1868 and 1893, one-seventh of all farms in Carniola had mortgage foreclosures.[2]

The peasants had been demanding freedom from landowners for over a century, but when it finally came, the costs were much higher than they had ever visualized. The peasants gained their independence, but the true victors of 1848 were the large landholders. Ironically, only a small number of landowners actively pursued reform in the Vormärz period, but those who did were correct in their predictions of increased economic benefit from a free peasantry. The compensation money made a great difference by ensuring a more rapid introduction of new technology and methods. Because of this, the emancipated peasant was at a competitive disadvantage he could not overcome.[3] Although a move toward capital-intensive agriculture had begun before 1848, the revolutionary reforms ensured that agriculture would keep moving steadily in that direction.[4]

Vestiges of the feudal system persisted after 1848, but gradual capitalization of agriculture was accompanied by industrialization and growth in urbanization throughout the latter half of the nineteenth century. Tied to all of these changes affecting the mass of the Slovene population was the discovery of nationalism. In some ways, it was a system of allegiance and values that replaced dying feudalism. As well, since the peasants had become obligated to the state (taxes replaced feudal obligations), the emperor may not have been seen as being as glorious and infallible as he had been before. The peasants had always blamed the landowners for their problems. Now that their feudal obligations had been eliminated and replaced by burdens to the state, the transition of allegiances to nationalism may have accelerated. All landed and landless peasants had to cope with a changed society -- a society that was increasingly influenced by the new perspective of nationalism.

---

[2] Hocevar, "Economic Determinants," **Papers in Slovene Studies**, p. 49 and p. 75 (footnote 43).

[3] Pech, **Czech Revolution of 1848**, pp. 289-290; and Good, **Economic Rise of the Habsburg Empire**, pp. 84-85.

[4] Hocevar, **Structure of the Slovenian Economy**, pp. 50-57.

Much discussion and soul searching among the Slovene intellectuals during the revolutionary years led to a more solidified and nationalized Slovene bourgeois in the period that followed. The political suppression of the neo-absolutist 1850s led the liberals to channel their energies toward cultural activities. Both the conservative and the radical nationalists were more willing to cooperate with the moderate liberals during this decade, because there was no political activism to cause major rifts.[5]

Some of the Slovene activists were temporarily unable to fully participate in the early period of awakening, however, because they were penalized for their involvement in revolutionary activities: Krajnc had problems getting teaching positions after 1848;[6] and Majar got into some trouble over the Frankfurt assembly pamphlets. Fittingly, Majar was moved out of the Slovene lands to a German diocese.[7] Nonetheless, since most Slovene intellectuals had displayed fairly unobtrusive behaviour during the years 1848-1849, they were able to participate in the development of Slovene culture that followed.

---

[5] Zwitter, "Slovenski politicni prerod XIX. stoletja," **Zgodovinski Casopis**, p. 152.

[6] See entry for Krajnc, **Slovenski Biografski Leksikon, Volume I**, p. 549.

[7] See entry for Majar, ibid., **Volume II**, p. 19.

One of the major developments of this decade included the establishment of a publishing association in Klagenfurt (1852) that still exists today. This organization was co-founded by Bishop Slomsek for the purpose of publishing affordable Slovene reading materials for education and pleasure.[8] The publishing of Slovene materials continued to expand with the help of other Slovene intellectuals, including the former parliamentary delegate Fran Miklosic. In the early 1860s, he co-produced upper Gymnasium readers that contained poetry and translations (mainly from other Slavic languages, rather than from German).[9] Interest in Slovene educational materials eventually led leaders to begin lobbying for the preservation of their language through control of their schools. School control was in fact the first main goal of Slovene awakeners in the second half of the nineteenth century, while the second major point of interest was the unification of their people in a single territory.[10]

Political rights were restored in the 1860s, but activists were more cautious than they had been in 1848. Some men, like Majar, retreated from specific demands for ethnic unity, and instead concentrated on the historic rights of the Slovene provinces. There were others who still supported the united "Slovenija" programs, but, in the end, the government refused all applications for change.[11] The Slovene awakeners had a better network than they had had in 1848, however, and they were able to put their energies to work in other cultural developments.

---

[8] Novak, "Roots of Slovene National Individuality," **Papers in Slovene Studies**, p. 108.

[9] Jelavich, **South Slav Nationalisms**, p. 246.

[10] ibid., p. 28.

[11] Rogel, **Slovenes and Yugoslavism**, pp. 18-19.

These cultural activities included the establishment of reading rooms, which were important centres for the organization of further nationalist development.[12] The popularity of reading rooms acted as catalysts in the organization of mass outdoor meetings, called tabori, in the late-1860s and early-1870s. Historians believe that these meetings helped conclude "a long process of Slovene maturation into nationhood."[13] The largest tabor was held in Vizmarje, Carniola, and was attended by an estimated 30,000 people.[14] Fittingly, the word tabori was originally used to describe primitive fortresses that peasants had built around hill-top churches in order to protect themselves from Turkish raids during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The organizational success of these defences gave the peasants confidence to demand changes from their nobles. The use of mass organization as a medium for both defensive and offensive activities was echoed centuries later when the idea of tabori was resurrected in aid of Slovene nationalism.[15]

The tabori were timely activities, since in the 1870s the Slovenes came into sharp conflict with the central government, the German bourgeoisie and German nationalism in general. The Slovenes were still unsure about their relationship with Germans in 1848, but, by the 1870s, both German and Slovene nationalism had matured to a critical point. Slovene nationalism was both a growing ethnic threat and a potential barrier to economic gain. Demands of growing Slovene nationalism could only be achieved at the expense of German domination and power. Related to this challenge was the important loss of Venice in 1866. With this concession, Trieste became the main Austrian port and a significant component to the maintenance and growth of Austro-German big business.[16]

---

[12] Joze Pirjevec, "Slovene Nationalism in Trieste, 1848-1982," **Nationalities Papers** (Vol. XI, No. 2, 1983), p. 154.

[13] Novak, "Roots of Slovene National Individuality," **Papers in Slovene Studies**, p. 109.

[14] Hocevar, "Economic Determinants," **Papers in Slovene Studies**, p. 53.

[15] Novak, "Roots of Slovene National Individuality," **Papers in Slovene Studies**, pp. 83-84.

The 1870s also saw the emergence of two powerful Slovene political organizations in the central Slovene lands: the conservatives and the liberals. Traces of both were evident in 1848, but neither was fully developed. The Kavcic compensation proposal, with its plan to sell off ecclesiastical lands as a way to reduce church power, represents an early liberal position. Bishop Slomsek's initial stand against revolutionary activities in general, and specifically against the reorganization of the empire, was eventually altered to cautious approval of some nationalist activity in 1848. His views are typical of the early group of conservatives who eventually became known as the "Clericals," a political entity whose power has endured into this century.[17]

For the Slovenes the mid-nineteenth century marked an important period of transition -- a time which laid important groundwork for the exciting, and often difficult, years to come. It was a time that marked the transition from agriculture to industry, from feudalism and provincialism to equality, independence and nationalism. The revolution of 1848-1849 was an important catalyst for these changes and represented a meeting point of the Slovene past and future. Because the population was almost fully agrarian, the agricultural reforms of the revolutionary years were extremely important. The small Slovene intelligentsia of 1848-1849 was mostly interested in nationalism, but there were a few Slovenes of a more moderate outlook who addressed both of these two important issues during the revolution, and specifically at the constitutional parliament. Their efforts ensured that a free agrarian population would, soon after the revolution, be awakened, politicized and interested in nationhood.

---

[16] ibid., p. 109.

[17] Rogel, **Slovenes and Yugoslavism**, p. 27.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Published Monographs:

Fischel, Alfred, editor. **Materialen zur Sprachenfrage in Österreich**. Brünn: F. Irrgang, 1902.

Kopitar, Jernij. **Grammatik der Slawischen Sprache in Krain, Kärnten und Steyermark**. Reprint of the original 1808 publication. Munich: R. Trofenik, 1970.

Rupel, Mirko, editor. **Slovenski protestantski pisci**. Ljubljana: Tiskovna Zadruga, 1934.

Springer, Anton, editor. **Protokolle des Verfassungs-Ausschusses im österreichischen Reichstage, 1848-1849**. Leipzig: Verlag von S. Hirzel, 1885.

Stiles, William H. **Austria in 1848-1849**. Reprint of the original 1852 publication. New York: Arno Press Inc., 1971.

Monographs and Pamphlets from the Juridisch-Politischer Leseverein Collection, University of Alberta Libraries:

Andrian-Werburg, Viktor von. **Oesterreich und dessen Zukunft**. Hamburg: Hoffman und Campe, 1843.

Andrian-Werburg, Viktor von. **Oesterreich und dessen Zukunft. Zweiter Theil**. Hamburg: Ludwig Giese, 1847.

Brauner, Franz August. **Böhmische Bauernzustände im Interesse der Landeskultur und des Nationalwohlstandes besprochen**. Vienna: Schmidt & Leo, 1847.

Brauner, Franz August. **Von der Robot und deren Ablösung für den böhmischen und mährischen Landmann: in böhmischer und deutscher Sprache**. Prague: Kronberger und Rziwnatz, 1848.

Kosler, Peter. **Das Programm der Linken des österreichischen Reichstages mit Rücksicht auf Slovenisch-und Italienisch-Oesterreich**. Vienna: Mechitharisten-Buchdruckerei, 1849.

Published Governmental Series:

Sammlung der politischen Geseße [Gesetze] und Verordnungen für das Laibacher Gouvernement-Gebiet im Königreiche Illyrien. Volume 30 (1848). Ljubljana: Eger'schen Buchdruckerei, 1855.

Stenographischer Bericht über die Verhandlungen der deutschen constituierenden Nationalversammlung zu Frankfurt am Main. Volume IV. Franz Jakob Wigar, editor. Frankfurt a. M.: Sauerländer, 1848.

Verhandlungen des österreichischen Reichstages nach der stenographischen Aufnahme. Volumes I-V. Vienna: der kaiserlich-königlichen Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, 1848-1849.

Published in Microform:

Tafeln zur Statistik der österreichischen Monarchie. Vienna: Österreichische Staatsdruckerei, 1859. Series 1842-1846. Microfiche. Bishops Stortford, England: Chadwyck-Healey, 1975-1977.

Wiener Zeitung. Vienna. Series 1848-1849. Microfilm. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms International.

Documents Published in a Modern Periodical:

Palacky, Frantisek. English translation of the "Letter sent by Frantisek Palacky to Frankfurt (11th April, 1848)," **Slavonic and East European Review**. William Beardmore, translator. Volume XXVI, Number 67. April, 1948. Pages 303-308.

Palacky, Frantisek. English translation of the "Manifesto of the First Slavonic Congress to the Nations of Europe (12th June, 1848)," **Slavonic and East European Review**. William Beardmore, translator. Volume XXVI, Number 67. April, 1948. Pages 309-313.

Unpublished Document:

Smrekar, A. **Gruß und Kuß den freien Wiener Brüdern!** Graz, 1848. From the Houghton Library's collection of pamphlets and broadsides written in 1848-1849, Harvard University, Boston.

Secondary Sources

Monographs:

Anderson, Perry. **Lineages of the Absolutist State**. Fifth edition. London and New York: Verso, 1989.

Apih, Josip. **Slovenci in 1848. leto**. Ljubljana: Matica Slovenska, 1888.

Banac, Ivo. **The National Question in Yugoslavia: Origins, History, Politics**. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1984.

Barker, Thomas M. **The Slovene Minority in Carinthia**. Boulder: East European Monographs, 1984.

Blum, Jerome. **The End of the Old Order in Rural Europe**. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978.

Blum, Jerome. **Noble Landowners and Agriculture in Austria, 1815-1848**. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1948.

Brandt, Harm-Hinrich. "The Revolution of 1848 and the Problem of Central European Nationalities." **Nation-Building in Central Europe**. Hagen Schulze, editor. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1987. Pages 107-134.

Burian, Peter. **Die Nationalitäten in 'Cisleithanien' und das Wahlrecht der März-Revolution, 1848-1849; zur Problematik der Parlamentarismus im alten Österreich**. Graz and Cologne: H. Böhlaus Nachf., 1962.

Good, David F. **The Economic Rise of the Habsburg Empire, 1750-1914**. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1984.

Geist-Lanyi, Paula. **Das Nationalitätenproblem auf dem Reichstag zu Kremsier 1848/49**. Munich: Drei Masken Verlag, 1920.

Grafenauer, Bogo. **Zgodovina slovenskega naroda**. Second edition. Volumes 1-5. Ljubljana: Drzava zalozba Slovenije, 1964.

Helfert, J. A. von. **Aufzeichnungen und Erinnerungen aus jungen Jahren. Im Wiener konstituierenden Reichstag Juli bis Oktober 1848**. Vienna: A. Hölder, 1904.

Himka, John-Paul. **Galician Villagers and the Ukrainian National Movement in the Nineteenth Century**. Edmonton and London: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1988.

Hocevar, Toussaint. "Economic Determinants in the Development of the Slovene National System." **Papers in Slovene Studies 1975**. Rado L. Lencek, editor. New York: Society for Slovene Studies, 1975. Pages 27-78.

Hocevar, Toussaint. **The Structure of the Slovenian Economy, 1848-1963**. New York: Studia Slovenica, 1965.

Jelavich, Charles. **South Slav Nationalisms: Textbooks and Yugoslav Union before 1914**. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1990.

Jones, Peter. **The 1848 Revolutions**. Second edition. London: Longman Group UK Limited, 1991.

Kann, Robert A. **A History of the Habsburg Empire, 1526-1918**. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974.

Kann, Robert A. **The Multinational Empire: Nationalism and National Reform in the Habsburg Monarchy, 1848-1918. Volume I: Empire and Nationalities**. Second edition. New York: Octagon Books, Inc., 1964.

Kann, Robert A. **The Multinational Empire: Nationalism and National Reform in the Habsburg Monarchy, 1848-1918. Volume II: Empire Reform**. Second edition. New York: Octagon Books, 1964.

Komlos, John, editor. **Economic Development in the Habsburg Monarchy in the Nineteenth Century: Essays**. Boulder and New York: East European Monographs, 1983.

Lencek, Rado L. **The Structure and History of the Slovene Language**. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica, 1982.

Link, Edith Murr. **The Emancipation of the Austrian Peasant, 1740-1798**. New York: Columbia University Press, 1949.

Loncar, Dragotin. **The Slovenes: A Social History (From Earliest Times to 1910)**. English edition of the original 1911 Slovene publication. Translated from the Slovene by Anthony J. Klancar. Cleveland: American Jugoslav Printing & Publishing CO., 1939.

Namier, Sir Lewis. **1848: The Revolution of the Intellectuals**. Fifth edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962.

Neweklowsky, Gerhard. "Trubars Katechismus von 1550 -- eine Konkordanz." **Protestantismus bei den Slowenen**. Gerhard Neweklowsky, et al, editors. Vienna: Wiener Slawistischer Almanach, Institute für Slawistik der Universität Wien, 1984. Pages 133-152.

Novak, Bogdan C. "At the Roots of Slovene National Individuality." **Papers in Slovene Studies 1975.** Rado L. Lencek, editor. New York: Society for Slovene Studies, 1975. Pages 79-125.

Ogris, Werner. "Die Rechtsentwicklung in Cisleithanien, 1848-1918." **Die Habsburgermonarchie 1848-1918, Band II: Verwaltung und Rechtswesen**. Adam Wandruszka and Peter Urbanitsch, editors. Vienna: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1975. Pages 538-662.

Orton, Lawrence D. **The Prague Slav Congress of 1848**. Boulder: East European Quarterly, 1978.

Österreichisches Biographisches Lexikon. Volume I. Leo Santifaller, editor. Graz and Cologne: Böhlau, 1957.

Pleterski, Janko. "Die Slowenen." **Die Habsburgermonarchie 1848-1918, Band III: Die Völker des Reiches**. Part Two. Adam Wandruszka and Peter Urbanitsch, editors. Vienna: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1980. Pages 801-838.

Pech, Stanley Z. **The Czech Revolution of 1848**. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1969.

Pogacnik, Joze. "Das Schicksal der Freisinger Denkmäler in der Slawistik." Joze Pogacnik, editor. **Freisinger Denkmäler**. Munich: Trofenik, 1968. Pages 3-17.

Rath, R. John. **The Viennese Revolution of 1848**. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1957.

Rigler, Jakob. **Zacetki slovenskega knjiznega jezika: The Origins of the Slovene Literary Language**. Ljubljana: Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti, 1968.

Rogel, Carole. "The Slovenes in the Revolutionary Period." **The Consortium on Revolutionary Europe, 1750-1850: Proceedings. Volume I**. Athens, Georgia: Consortium on Revolutionary Europe, 1972. Pages 264-274.

Rogel, Carole. **The Slovenes and Yugoslavism.** Boulder: East European Quarterly, 1977.

Rosdolsky, Roman. **Die Bauernabgeordneten im konstituierenden österreichischen Reichstag, 1848-1849**. Vienna: Europaverlag, 1976.

Rudolph, Richard L. "Economic Revolution in Austria? The Meaning of 1848 in Austrian Economic History." **Economic Development in the Habsburg Monarchy in the Nineteenth Century: Essays**. John Komlos, editor. Boulder: East European Monographs, 1983. Pages 165-182.

Rupel, Mirko. **Primus Truber: Leben und Werk des slowenischen Reformators**. Munich: Südosteuropa-Verlagsgesellschaft, 1965.

Sandgruber, Roman. **Österreichische Agrarstatistik, 1750-1918.** Munich: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 1978.

Slodnjak, Anton. "Über die nationbildene Kraft der Reformation bei den Slowenen." Branko Bercic, editor. **Abhandlungen über die slowenische Reformation**. Munich: Dr. Dr. Rudolf Trofenik, 1968. Pages 11-22.

Slovenski Biografski Leksikon, Volumes I and II. Reprints of the original 1932 and 1952 publications. Izidor Cankar and Franc Ksaver Lukman, editors. Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1976.

Stromberg, Roland N. **European Intellectual History since 1789**. Third edition. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1981.

Sutter, Berthold. "Die politische und rechtliche Stellung der Deutschen in Österreich 1848 bis 1918." **Die Habsburgermonarchie 1848-1918, Band III: Die Völker des Reiches**. Part one. Wandruszka, Adam and Peter Urbanitsch, editors. Vienna: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1980. Pages 154-339.

Taylor, A. J. P. **The Habsburg Monarchy, 1809-1918**. Second edition. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1951.

Vilfan, Sergij. "Die Agrarsozialpolitik von Maria Theresa bis Kudlich." **Der Bauer Mittel- und Osteuropas im sozio-ökonomischen Wandel des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts: Beitrage zu seiner Lage und deren Widerspiegelung in der zeitgenossischen Publizistik und Literatur.** Studienkreis für Kulturbeziehungen in Mittel- und Osteuropa. Cologne and Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 1973. Pages 1-52.

Vilfan, Sergij. **Pravna zgodovina Slovencev**. Ljubljana: Slovenska Matica, 1961.

Wangermann, Ernst. **The Austrian Achievement 1700-1800**. London: Thames and Hudson, 1973.

Wangermann, Ernst. **From Joseph II to the Jacobin Trials**. London: Oxford University Press, 1959.

Winter, Eduard. **Romantismus, Restauration und Frühliberalismus im österreichischen Vormärz**. Vienna: Europa Verlag, 1968.

Wright, William E. **Serf, Seigneur, and Sovereign: Agrarian Reform in Eighteenth-Century Bohemia**. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1966.

Secondary Sources: Periodicals:

Andrejevich, Milan. "Hard Times Ahead for Croatia and Slovenia." **Report on Eastern Europe**. Volume 2, Number 30 (26 July, 1991). Pages 42-48.

Apih, Joseph. "Die Slovenen und der constituierende Reichstag 1848/49." **Österreichisches Jahrbuch**. Volume 18 (1894). Pages 15-35.

Apih, Joseph. "Die slovenische Bewegung im Frühjahr und Vorsommer 1848." **Österreichisches Jahrbuch**. Volume 16 (1892). Pages 175-208.

Belec, Borut. "Zemljiskoposestne razmere v Jeruzalemskih goricah leta 1824: njihov razvoj in ucinek na danasnjo regionalno agrarno-socialno diferenciacijo." **Casopis za zgodovino in narodopisje**. Year 41, New Series Volume 6 (1970). Pages 50-67.

Churkina, I. V. "Politicheskaia programma Matii Maiara v 1848 godu." **Sovetskoe slavianovedenie**. Number 5 (1969). Pages 22-33.

Dimnik, Martin. "Gutenberg, Humanism, the Reformation and the Emergence of the Slovene Literary Language, 1550-1584." **Canadian Slavonic Papers**. Volume XXVI, Numbers 2/3 (June-September, 1984). Pages 141-158.

Hill, Peter. "Nation, Nationality and Multiculturalism in Europe." **Australian Slavonic and East European Studies**. Volume 4, Numbers 1/2 (1990). Pages 195-204.

Himka, John-Paul. "Hope in the Tsar: Displaced Naive Monarchism among the Ukrainian Peasants of the Habsburg Empire." **Russian History/Histoire Russe**. Volume 7, Parts 1/2 (1980). Pages 125-138.

Judson, Pieter M. "'Whether Race or Conviction Should Be the Standard': National Identity and Liberal Politics in Nineteenth-Century Austria." **Austrian History Yearbook**. Volume XXII (1991). Pages 76-95.

Kamenetsky, Christa. "Folklore Revival in Slovenia: A Quest for Cultural Identity." **School Library Journal**. May, 1974. Pages 1441-1445.

Koropec, Joze. "Polskavska zemljiska gospostva." **Casopis za zgodovino in narodopisje**. Year 51, New Series Volume 16 (1980). Pages 7-70.

Lencek, Rado L. "The Enlightenment's Interest in Languages and the National Revival of the South Slavs." **Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism**. Volume X, Number 1 (1983). Pages 111-134.

Lütge, Friedrich. "Die Grundentlastung (Bauernbefreiung) in Steiermark." **Zeitschrift für Agrargeschichte und Agrarsoziologie**. Year 16 (1968). Pages 190-209.

Melik, Vasilij. "Majarjeva peticija za zedinjeno Slovenijo 1848." **Casopis za zgodovino in narodopisije**. Year 50, New Series Volume 15, Numbers 1/2 (1979). Pages 286-294.

Pech, Stanley Z. "The Nationalist Movements of the Austrian Slavs in 1848: A Comparative Sociological Profile." **Histoire Sociale-Social History**. Volume IX, Number 18 (November, 1976). Pages 336-356.

Pech, Stanley Z. "The Press of the Habsburg Slavs in 1848: Contribution to a Political Profile." **Canadian Journal of History**. Volume X, Issue 1 (April, 1975). Pages 35-49.

Pirjevec, Joze. "Slovene Nationalism in Trieste, 1848-1982." **Nationalities Papers**. Volume XI, Number 2 (Fall, 1983). Pages 152-161.

Simons, Thomas W., Jr. "The Peasant Revolt of 1846 in Galicia: Recent Polish Historiography." **Slavic Review**. Volume 30, Number 4 (December, 1971). Pages 795-817.

Umek, Ema. "Usmerjenost publikacij Kranjske Kmetijske Druzbe v letih 1770 do 1779." **Kronika -- Casopis za slovensko krajevno zgodovino**. Volume XV, Number 3 (1967). Pages 149-151.

Winter, Eduard. "Early Liberalism in the Habsburg Monarchy: Religious and National Thought, Particularly of the Austrian Slavs, 1792-1868." **East Central Europe**. Volume I, Part 1 (1974). Pages 1-11.

Zgonik, Mavricij. "Prehajanje konjisko-oplotniske gracinske posesti na kapitalisticno gospodarjenje zozuje in odpravlja servitutne pravice." **Casopis za zgodovino in narodopisje**. Year 46, New Series Volume 11 (1975). Pages 43-63.

Zwitter, Fran. “The Slovenes and the Habsburg Monarchy.” **Austrian History Yearbook**. Volume III, Part 2 (1967). Pages 159-188.

Zwitter, Fran, “Slovenski politicni prerod XIX. stoletja v okviru evropske nacionalne problematike.” **Zgodovinski Casopis**. Volume XVIII (1964). Pages 75-127.